

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 197 251

CG 014 898

AUTHOR McGuigan, Dorothy G., Ed.
 TITLE Changing Family, Changing Workplace: New Research.
 CEW Research Series, Number 4.
 INSTITUTION Michigan Univ., Ann Arbor. Center for Continuing
 Education for Women.
 SPONS AGENCY Ford Foundation, New York, N.Y.
 PUB DATE 80
 NOTE 95p.
 AVAILABLE FROM University of Michigan, Center for Continuing
 Education of Women, 330 Thompson Street, Ann Arbor,
 MI 48109 (\$4.00)

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
 DESCRIPTORS Attitude Measures; Careers; *Employed Women; *Family
 Life; Interaction Process Analysis; *Marriage; *Sex
 Role; *Social Environment; Spouses; Stress Variables;
 Surveys; *Work Environment
 IDENTIFIERS *Support Systems

ABSTRACT

The studies in this volume highlight new research on the interaction of work and family and were presented at the 1978 conference, "Changing Family, Changing Workplace," held at the University of Michigan. The report on changes in the marriage role between 1957 and 1976 indicates that the family is still the core area of significance to the individual. At the same time, according to research on changes in sex-role attitudes of women, women's views of themselves have changed dramatically over the last two decades. The recent study of women who came to the University of Michigan between 1965 and 1973 concludes that women who have successfully moved into careers are happier with their lives than are women who have not. The profile of 1977 high school seniors reports the students' openness to sharing family and work responsibilities. The investigation of workplace stress shows that most such stress is moderated by a support system of family and friends. Overall, the volume demonstrates that the family as an institution continues to accommodate itself to changes in the larger society. (Author/CS)

 * Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
 * from the original document. *

ED197251

HARD COPY NOT AVAILABLE

CHANGING FAMILY, CHANGING WORKPLACE

NEW RESEARCH

Edited by

Dorothy G. McGuigan

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY
HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Jean H. Campbell

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

The University of Michigan
Center for Continuing Education of Women
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48109

CG 014898

The papers in this collection were given at a conference, "Changing Family, Changing Workplace," on November 6, 1978 at the University of Michigan. The conference and this publication were made possible by a grant from the Ford Foundation.

No. IV in CEW Research Series

Technical assistance by Lucinda Palmer

Copyright 1980 by the University of Michigan

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
2. Women, Work and Family Louise A. Tilly, Department of History, University of Michigan	5
3. The Marriage Role: 1957 to 1976 Elizabeth Douvan, Department of Psychology, University of Michigan	27
4. Changes in the Sex Role Attitudes of Women, 1962-1977: Evidence from a Panel Study Arland Thornton, Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan, and Deborah Freedman, Department of Economics, University of Michigan	39
5. High School Seniors' Preferences for Division of Labor in the Family--1977 A. Regula Herzog, J.G. Bachman and L.D. Johnston, Survey Research Center, University of Michigan	45
6. Combining Families and Careers: Views from Different Points of the Life Cycle Jean D. Manis, Center for Continuing Education of Women, University of Michigan, and Hazel Markus, Department of Psychology and Center for Continuing Education of Women, University of Michigan.	51
7. Work, Stress and Social Support Robert L. Kahn, Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan	67
8. Group Process Intervention Research in Alternative Human Service Settings Shulamit Reinharz, Department of Psychology, University of Michigan	77
9. Compensation vs. Spillover in Work and Non-Work Relationships: Excerpt from a Panel Discussion Denise Rousseau, Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan	87
10. Corporate Day Care and the Play Life of the Child: Excerpt from a Panel Discussion Val Suransky, Department of Educational Psychology, University of Michigan	89

WORK AND FAMILY INTERACTION: AN INTRODUCTION

If the two worlds of work and family were ever really separate worlds--and historian Louise Tilly leads us to doubt that this was true even during the first wave of industrialization--it surely is true no longer. Today, as women enter the paid labor force in increasing numbers, as more and more single parents shoulder major responsibilities in both domains, the impingement of the two worlds on one another is increasingly evident. Yet researchers have paid little attention to the problems engendered by that intersection. As psychologist Robert Kahn points out in his study of work-derived stress, "Societies set their own priorities. Our concern has been with material output and organizational success, not with the quality of the work experience and its relationship to family life."

The studies in this volume present some new research on the interaction of work and family. What are the stresses of the workplace that spill over into family life--and what can be done about it? Is the value of the family diminishing in our society? Has the family become, as psychologist Sue Golden remarked in opening the conference reported here, "a dumping ground for some of the stresses of the workplace?" Do successful career women opt out of family life? And how do young Americans propose to dovetail their future family-and-work lives?

Challenging older historical views of the effects of proletarianization on the family, Louise Tilly traces through case histories in industrial France the astonishing resilience of the family structure, the remarkable ability of the family to develop strategies to cope with change and stress. High fertility and high illiteracy characterized the families of domestic weavers in northern France in pre-industrial times, when the need for multiple workers laid a heavy burden on child-bearing women and on children put out to work at an early age. As industrialization progressed, child labor diminished and working husbands often gained a marginal leisure. But the mothers in these families, released from continuous child-bearing, had to enter the paid work force themselves to sustain the family economy, at the same time providing supportive services at home to support their children's and husbands' leisure.

As to the value individuals place on the family, psychologist Elizabeth Douvan, examining a new longitudinal survey of the American family, reports that the family is still the core area of significance to the individual, and that there is a rather strong trend toward increased happiness in marriage. Both men and women value their family attachments above their work roles, almost without exception. Where persons are spouses, parents and

workers, the spouse role takes precedence over either parent or work role. At the same time Americans have developed increased tolerance toward a range of life styles and no longer view singlehood as aberrant. And which groups suffer exceptional stress in our society? Two groups without the usual family ties: divorced women and single men.

Meantime, women's views of themselves have changed dramatically over the last decade or two, report researchers Arland Thornton and Deborah Freedman. The rise in female employment and the increased divorce rate, together with a sharp decline in fertility, have been accompanied by a notable rejection of the traditional definition of labor and authority between women and men, and toward a much more egalitarian view of the sex roles. The only groups who tend to cling to more traditional views are women with large families and fundamentalist Protestants, while younger women, better-educated women, working women, and those with better-educated husbands have been more likely to adopt egalitarian sex role attitudes.

How does work affect women's sense of life satisfaction? A recent study of women who came to the University of Michigan Center for Continuing Education of Women between 1965 and 1973 concludes that women who have successfully moved into careers appear overall to be happier with their lives than women who have not. Yet, buttressing the Douvan findings, very few of these survey respondents indicated that they would forego the satisfactions of marriage and children for the satisfactions of a career. And if they had their lives to plan and live over again? Most of the women in the study would "start sooner and aim higher--and choose career goals that would require their fullest capacities."

If women's views of themselves and of their place in the worlds of work and family have changed in critical ways over the last decade, American young people too reflect change. A study of 1977 high school seniors reports their openness toward a future sharing of both family and work responsibilities. Most look toward marriages in which the work-load within the family will be divided, with child care shared between mothers and fathers--even in situations where the mother does not work.

Robert Kahn reports that the most common stresses of the workplace--time use, role overload, underutilization of the worker's talent and capacity--are moderated by a good support system of family and friends, by one's membership in a network that provides esteem, affection, care. Even the severe strain of job loss can be effectively mediated by the proper support. Kahn pinpoints areas for constructive change, from which both work and family would benefit: improvement in the quality of the workplace--especially genuine flexibility in work scheduling--and the teaching of social support.

Introduction

Finally, three scholars whose research has been notably action-oriented report on the development of alternative work-settings during the counter-culture movement of the sixties as "a laboratory for the ideal workplace"; on the relationship of work patterns to non-work patterns; and finally a critical scrutiny of the burgeoning child care industry, dedicated to material profit rather than the warm, nurturant care of young children.

While the scholars represented in this volume report that the dynamics of the family are indeed changing, that attitudes toward sex roles have already changed, that the workplace has not yet made appropriate accommodation to the well-being of the family, nevertheless the overall tone is one of optimism. They are saying that despite the stress of rapid social change, despite the lagging response of the workplace to human needs, the institution of the family continues to accommodate itself to change in the larger society. The family remains the most valuable bulwark for men and women in late twentieth century society.

--D.G.M.

WOMEN, WORK AND FAMILY:

A HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE*

Louise A. Tilly
Department of History
University of Michigan

Here is how Mémé Santerre, a French working woman, describes the work life of her family around the turn of the century:

The [village] men didn't like to have their wives away from home. They needed them in the cellar....There in the big half-dark room, lit only by several high windows, were the looms on which everyone in the village wove during the winter months for eighteen hours each day.

After my time at school--being the youngest, I was given the chance to go...I too had "my loom." I was still so tiny when I first wove that I had to have wooden "skates" attached to my feet so I could reach the pedals. My legs were too short to reach them....

At four a.m. we awoke. Dressing quickly with water from the court fifty meters away, where a well served all the families in our coron, and hop! we went down to the cellar with two coal-oil lamps....Mama tended to the house-cleaning, scoured the floor, scraped the table with a shard of glass, threw fresh sawdust on the tiles, and boiled potatoes, and at the same time prepared the warps that we would weave the next day. My sisters and I, we made handkerchiefs that we wove into big rolls of linen. My father, who was more skillful, made the wider pieces of linen...himself.

Every Saturday, one after another, running, because we wished to waste as little time as possible, we would take our cloth to the agent, a neighbor who collected the work, and gave us the money for it....I would return home and give the money to my mother. Then my sisters would go, then papa, to take their work.

We couldn't make ends meet with these earnings. We had to live all winter on credit. We paid up on our return from the season in the country, which took us away from home for six months, to a farm in the Seine-Inférieure.

From May to November each year, the Gardez, Mémé's natal family, worked on the farm in Normandy. Here Mémé describes the work on the farm:

The domaine of Saint-Martin where we worked produced only wheat and sugar-beets. It belonged to a big company in Paris which owned farms throughout France. We were paid by the job. The more one did, the more one earned. And each family member had his or her allocation of land.

We were paid all together when we left in November, a large quantity of money such as we never otherwise saw at one time....We set to work at 6 a.m. We could see the size of the farm; fields rolling to infinity; in early May the fields were covered with fine green sprouts. Fields of wheat undulated further out, and those were the fields we worked in first, to pull out the thistles....

It was hard work, however, for a little girl! When I saw the parcel that had been assigned to me stretching out, it seemed as though I would never get to the end, for the rows were long....Once a row was finished, one had to turn immediately and make one's way, back, standing upright as little as possible...then we had to thin the sugar beets. Interminable furrows where we left the strongest and best-centered plants so that the row would be straight as the letter "I." Each row brought us three sous. We could do up to four in a day, if we didn't fool around or look at the flies in the process; we worked bent constantly over the furrow, a foot on each side and a short hoe in our hands.¹

The immediacy and simplicity of this autobiographical account of work and family recommends it as a text for the historian. Such first-hand texts are rare, for workers and peasants of the period were seldom able to write their own memories. We owe this account to a journalist who tape-recorded and edited the life history of the elderly Mémé Santerre about five years ago.

The story piqued my historian's imagination, and I began to explore the history of the handloom weavers/farm laborers from the small city of Avesnes-les-Aubert, near Cambrai in the department of the Nord. Evidence for the life of these workers has been gathered from the brave and moving autobiography of Mémé Santerre, which tells about three generations of her family: her mother and father, born in 1848, Mémé, their youngest child, born in 1891, and her son, born in 1911. Other materials from French municipal, departmental and national archives, newspapers, and scholarly works, of the period and since, were examined for systematic evidence on the lives of the people of Avesnes-les-Aubert.²

The Weaver/Farm Laborers of Avesnes-les-Aubert. The Avesnes weavers were known as Camberlots, after the chief city of their region. Their lives were shaped by their work as domestic weavers in a period when the industry was being undermined by the growth of a large-scale textile industry. As their livelihood became more and more precarious, the villagers sought other means to support their families. There were jobs for workers in the nearby sugar beet fields, so the first adaptation of the Camberlots was to supplement weaving with farm day labor in the Nord. The sub-prefect of Cambrai, in his responses to the national "Enquête industrielle" of 1873, noted that subdivisions at succession had led to an increased number of tiny farms and landless laborers. Both former peasants and weavers sought work in the sugar beet fields. The combination of agricultural work and weaving produced, he noted, "very fortunate conditions which visibly increased their well-being."³

Within a few years, however, official reports were less sanguine. In 1878 an "Enquête" on the condition of weavers in the Nord said that "in the arrondissement of Cambrai in particular, handloom weavers are being replaced by machines--and they must find other ways to live...in general, the workers received barely two-thirds of what they need to buy bread, not to speak of housing or clothing." Another report notes: "The workers understand what is happening and they don't struggle against events; some of them have emigrated, others work in the fields; unfortunately, the population is too dense for agriculture to support their needs, but most of them stay because they own a little house and are certain that they can't find a job elsewhere."⁴ This opinion, that the workers were passive, proved to be wishful thinking. In 1889, in 1895, and in 1906, there were large weavers' strikes for higher wages in Avesnes.

A recent study of temporary migrations in France shows how conditions continued to change in the 1880's and '90's. Sugar beet agribusiness and chicory cultivation came into the Nord. These farmers brought their own workers, Belgians who had already worked for them in their native country. The Camberlot weavers/farm laborers, denied employment in agriculture near by, followed the cultivation of the sugar beet to Normandy and the Paris region, about 100 miles away.⁵ This adaptation delayed the final collapse of the domestic linen-weaving industry. Ironically then, the Camberlots moved from work in manufacturing into agriculture, albeit capitalist agriculture. This Camberlot way of life was an adaptation to specific circumstances in the Nord. It was a case of people preserving an old way of living--weaving linen in the cottages of Avesnes--through what looks like a rather drastic series of expediencies, which continued for many until the First World War broke the back of the domestic weaving industry.

Industrial Workers in Roubaix. The situation of the Camberlot weavers/farm laborers contrasts sharply with that of residents of Roubaix in the same period. Roubaix, an industrial city also in the department of the Nord about 40 miles from Avesnes and Cambrai, had been an important cotton textile-producing center from the 1820's on. Its manufacturers switched to wool in the 1860's, and the city boomed as a center of factory textile production. It was not a "typical" French city, but it shared many characteristics with other textile cities. Belgian migrants from areas of Belgium where domestic weaving was in a disastrous decline similar to that around Cambrai, were attracted to the rapidly growing city of Roubaix at the end of the nineteenth century.⁶ Migration to Roubaix was not seasonal. Yet it was probably temporary for many migrants, and conceived of initially as temporary by many others who later became permanent migrants. Thus migration to Roubaix and factory employment there were other possible adaptations of families whose livelihood in the domestic textile industry was being destroyed. Rather than sharing manufacturing and agriculture, as did the people of Avesnes, who all the while continued to be proletarians, migrants to Roubaix moved to the prototypical industrial setting--a factory textile city.

The chief source of evidence for Roubaix is a collective biography, a machine-readable file of a systematic sample of all individuals in ten percent of the households drawn from the national censuses of 1872 and 1906. Family relationships and labor force participation, as well as individual characteristics (age, sex, marital status) for individuals within households, household residence patterns and other characteristics have been analyzed. Other material about Roubaix includes archival, newspaper, and secondary information on housing, wages, prices, material culture, work process, institutions and collective action.⁷

The two case studies of Avesnes and Roubaix present very different consequences of the growth of industrial capitalism. The case of Avesnes-les-Aubert is one of economic decline and increasingly desperate expedients, leading to preservation of an old way of working and its very slow transformation. The case of Roubaix is a capitalist success story in terms of rapid industrial growth. For workers of Roubaix it meant migration, disciplined factory wage labor, unhealthy and crowded living conditions but rapid change in many aspects of their lives.

Family Strategies. The cases represent two aspects of family-work connections in industrial France. They illustrate how family goals, family life and family strategies varied in systematic ways with circumstances. This study challenges the oversimplification which assumes a relatively uniform progress toward an ideal "industrial" family accompanying economic change. It examines instead the different paths followed by real people

in a transition from domestic or home industry to industrialism. The behavior of these real people can be observed collectively and anonymously in the patterns described in censuses and in administrative reports for Roubaix and Avesnes, and individually in the life history of Mémé Santerre. The systematic links between individual and collective biographies on the one hand, and economic structure and work, on the other go through family strategies.

Analysis of strategy tries to uncover the principles which lead to observable regularities or patterns of behavior among households. Who participates in making family decisions and what concerns and constraints impinge on them? Who bears the costs or benefits from strategies in which individual interests or needs are often subordinated?

A focus on family strategies moves away from any implicit acceptance of the powerlessness of people caught up in a process of large scale structural change, on the one hand, or, on the other hand, the attempt to see into people's minds, to deduce mentality or attitude from behavior, which is implicitly tautological. The concept of family strategies works as a series of hypotheses about "implicit principles," as Pierre Bourdieu puts it, principles that are less rigid or articulated than "rules."⁸ These principles guide the household, not the individual, nor the society as a whole, in its process of decision-making.

There are family strategies about migration, about fertility, about schooling and about labor force participation, about the co-residence of children and the age of marriage--all prosaic but fundamental decisions in family life. Historically, we can seldom tell who makes these decisions but we can examine the different effects that strategies have on individuals, depending on their position and activities in the family. All household members' imperatives and choices are shaped by their position in the family, by the economic and social structures in which the household is located, and by the processes of change which these structures are undergoing.

Strategies, Bourdieu shows, tend to reproduce social relations. When circumstances are changing, however, strategies can change, too. Whether, how and when they change are important questions that bring us close to the problem of "relating and valuing," even if they cannot inform directly on values.⁹ Analysis of household and family strategies addresses social behavior in the past at a level where meaningful analysis can be done; it examines decision-making principles which are voluntary and problematic and yet are capable of being known. Focusing on the effect of economic structure and work on family strategy provides a means of understanding some behavior, but not all of it.

Let us return now to that part of nineteenth century French workers' lives in which work and family intersect. In each case two kinds of questions are asked. How did family strategies cope with and reflect the circumstances of proletarianization of work? What were the consequences for women in these families? These questions will be examined during two periods, the 1870's and after 1900, for several specific strategies: marriage, fertility, schooling, labor force participation.

Camberlot Life. Here, briefly sketched, are the life stories of the two women of the weaver/farm laborer families of Avesnes-les-Aubert. Mémé's mother, the elder Marie Catherine, was illiterate; she married young; she and her husband set up a new household and had thirteen children. As the children grew up, each was set to work in turn at the looms in the cellar and in the fields of Normandy. Their youngest daughter, Mémé, went to school for four years before she joined her sisters and her father in the cellar. She married at 18 and set up a new household with Auguste Santerre, a weaver/farm laborer like her father. After 1914 Mémé and Auguste stayed in Normandy, becoming full-time workers on the farm and in the sugar beet refinery. They had only one son, whom they sent to school and apprenticed. He left home to follow his occupation and eventually married. Mémé and Auguste later moved (although continuing to work for the same large agribusiness), to live near their son. This move brought them to the Paris region, where all three finally died.

What were the family strategies in the Gardez family of Avesnes-les-Aubert and of the other villagers in the last quarter of the nineteenth century?

Fertility was high in the small city of Avesnes-les-Aubert during this period. Mémé Santerre believed that most families in their coron (the attached row of brick weavers' cottages) had at least ten children. She also notes that many families took six or eight children to work in the fields. Her own natal family had thirteen children, her husband's at least eleven.¹⁰ The child/woman ratio (children under five per ever-married woman aged 20 to 49) for the village, calculated from the 1886 census summary, was 1.3, an extremely high rate.¹¹

Apparently families in Avesnes were doing little at the end of the nineteenth century to restrain their fertility, despite the poverty in which they lived. For them in fact children could be a solution to their poverty, for multiple wage earners in a family were the most certain route to an adequate income. Nevertheless, many years had to pass before children could contribute to family income, and those years could be difficult years for the family economy.

Parents waited anxiously for the moment when the children grew up and became wage workers. They did not invest in their children's futures by sending them to school. Both Mémé's parents, Marie Catherine Gardez and her husband Pierre, were illiterate. The 1873 "Enquête industrielle" remarked that only about one quarter of the adult manufacturing workers in the arrondissement of Cambrai knew how to read and write. Mémé's older brother and sisters had been needed as workers on the looms in the cellar of the cottage and in the fields and they never went to school. This alternating pattern of work kept the children busy the year around, and left no "dead season" like that in settled agriculture, in which the children could attend school.¹² Even in the 1890's, weaver families apparently continued to act according to a similar short-term strategy. Mémé's school attendance in the 1890's was probably a consequence of her birth order rather than changed strategy. Auguste Santerre, later to be Mémé's husband, was born in 1888, the oldest of eleven children in another Avesnes weaver/farm laborer family. He did not attend school, despite the free compulsory schooling decreed by French law in 1884. Until parents had the extra income provided by several child workers, they did not send children to school.

The other side of lack of schooling for children was their labor force participation. We don't know at what age Mémé's mother, Marie Catherine Gardez, started to weave with her parents, but it was probably very early. In 1873, the "Enquête industrielle" noted that twenty percent of the industrial labor force of the Cambrai arrondissement were children. Marie Catherine Gardez' children all descended to the looms in the cellar of the cottage in Avesnes by the age of eight to ten, the youngest, Mémé, starting to weave at ten. She notes that her father criticized families who took their five- and six-year-olds into the fields. He said, "There is a time for everything in life. Just because you yourself started work early with kicks in the behind, you don't have to press your own children the same way."¹³ He felt that it was early enough to start field work at eleven, which is when his children began. Early labor force participation was part of the end of the century pattern in agriculture as well as industry.

An illustration of the fragility of such a high fertility strategy occurs in Mémé's poignant story of her parents. In 1871 when the Gardez were a young couple with three children under five, Pierre was called to serve in the Franco-Prussian War. A tragic drama ensued. Marie Catherine, pregnant with her fourth child, was not able to weave enough to support herself and her three little children. She had to give her infant to a neighbor to mind, and the baby died because of the sitter's carelessness. The two little girls both became ill and died. When Gardez got news of his children's deaths, he ran away from his regiment and rushed

home--to weave. He flung himself into the cellar like a madman and vowed that he would not leave until he had woven enough cloth to support his wife through the birth of their fourth child. The military police who came to take him back to his unit respected that desperate need and let him stay home to finish the work. The couple's division of labor required the husband's labor and wages to support his wife in her child-bearing years when there were no children old enough to work.

When the French census takers came around to the weavers' cottages in 1906, they listed no occupation for Marie Catherine Gardez. Yet Mémé testifies that her mother did a vital task, preparing the warps for the looms for her weaver husband and daughters. She also performed the services of housekeeper, cook, and so on for her husband and those children still at home. She received no separate wage; only the weavers were paid for each piece of cloth they took to the merchant's agent. Both husband and daughters immediately handed over their wages to her, the wife and mother, to spend for the consumption needs of the family. There was no surplus for the head of the household to spend on his personal leisure or pleasure. The family, in fact, lived most of the winter on credit for their very bread; they only paid the baker on their return from the farming season in Normandy.

In the weavers' cottages, husbands, wives and children made vital contributions to the family economy. Since there was no surplus, there was no inequality in distributing it. When in the last summer before Mémé's marriage, the family did not go to Normandy, everyone restricted consumption further and worked harder. The family ate no meat at all; they repaired their shoes with bits of leather from the harness of their looms. Mémé remarks that it was hard for the children to understand. "But did we ever understand? We spoke so little among ourselves. There was no place in life for words. Our fixed, our only goal, was to eat, sleep, and work."¹⁵

Although couples had many children and valued them as workers, nevertheless grown children tended to marry young in Avesnes-les-Aubert. Marie Catherine Gardez and her daughter Mémé married at eighteen or earlier. (Marie Catherine Gardez' age of marriage was deduced from the fact that at twenty-two, in 1871, she had three children and was about to give birth to a fourth.) Both women set up households apart from their parents. Apparently the older couple had no relatives in the village, for the mother had to go to a neighbor for assistance with child care in 1871. Mémé lived close to her mother (at her birth her brother had declared to the parents that this daughter would be their "crutch in their old age.") She benefited from her mother's warp making even when she was married

and weaving with her husband in another cottage. Mémé's mother also cared for the little son of Mémé and Auguste while they were busy weaving, and took care of him for the entire summer season when the younger couple went to Normandy. The older Gardez children, born in the 1870's and 1880's, also had married and left home early. In 1906, only four unmarried sisters were at home, ages fourteen (Mémé herself), seventeen, eighteen and twenty, according to the census listing. The census also shows that her sister Zulma had her first child when she was seventeen; her sister Lucie had her first child when she was nineteen; and the first child of her brother Leandre was born when his wife was twenty. The four other older sisters no longer lived in Avesnes; they had married farm laborers and lived elsewhere in the region.¹⁶ The age, sex, and marital status summaries of the census of 1886 make it possible to calculate proportions of single persons in various age cohorts in the village. These confirm a pattern of early marriage: only fifty percent of women aged twenty to twenty-four were single, twenty-eight percent of those twenty-five to twenty-nine, and three percent of those aged fifty to fifty-four.¹⁷

The family lives of the Gardez family and their neighbors in Avesnes-les-Aubert reflect the organization of their work as weavers and the web of opportunities they followed to find supplementary work as the domestic textile industry declined. They sought to maximize their children's labor and contribution to family subsistence and the family's future. They had many children and did not send them to school. Yet the fact that the productive unit was still the household led to early marriage and to the relatively brief co-residence of adult unmarried children. In the weaving period of their yearly work cycle, daughters received individual wages; in the agricultural labor phase they received no individual wage. Neither the family wage nor the household productive unit kept the family together, however. Just the contrary: there were a limited number of places in that household unit. With the four looms the Gardez owned, they could keep only four workers and a helper occupied at one time. As younger children took their place at the loom, older children moved on to find other work. Sometimes they moved into a situation of dependency resembling their household of origin, as servants. Sometimes they moved into situations where a household was the productive or work unit, as in the case of weaving or agricultural labor. In this case, they married and entered a new household, in order to work. The consequence of the continuation of a family wage and a household productive unit was an early break away from family of origin into family of procreation and repetition of behavior in the new household.

Urban, Industrial Life. How did family strategies in Roubaix cope with industrial conditions of work and life, and how did they compare with those of Avesnes?

Fertility was high in Roubaix, just as it was in Avesnes. Crude birth rates continued in the high thirties per thousand through the 1880's. (in 1886, thirty-six per thousand.) The child/woman ratio in 1872 was .86, lower than that of Avesnes. This figure reflects not simply births but infants who have survived up to five years of age. Infant mortality (deaths to children under one per 1000 births) in Roubaix in this period was consistently over 200. Thus, the Roubaix child-woman ratio, already high, understates fertility.¹⁸

Apparently Roubaix proletarian families were acting in ways similar to those in Avesnes as far as fertility was concerned, for their children could also become workers while quite young.

In the matter of schooling too Roubaix parents acted like those of Avesnes. They too were likely to be illiterate. The mayor of Roubaix noted that in 1864, only 29 percent of brides could sign the marriage act. He continued that this was not surprising, considering that "a great number of the marriage partners were born in Belgium from which they arrive, deprived of any instruction, to seek jobs..."¹⁹ The brides were less likely to sign than their grooms. The rate of signature--of Roubaix men--44.5 percent--revealed that the grooms were less literate than the men called to military service that year. This suggests a connection between migrant status and illiteracy, for the class called to military service was composed of native born men. The following year the mayor's report analyzed marrying persons by place of birth (but not by sex), and found that 45 percent of the French-born had signed the act, but only 26 percent of the Belgian-born.²⁰ Furet and Ozouf show a decline of literacy (as measured by ability to sign marriage acts) in the industrial arrondissements of the Nord, as the urban school systems were overwhelmed by the children of migrants and the marriage rolls were filled by illiterate adult migrants marrying in the city.²¹

Most of the children who lived in Roubaix in 1872 were not attending school. The public schools had places for only 33 percent of children under fifteen. Migrants to the city, like the weavers and seasonal migrants in agriculture, were not investing in their children's futures by sending them to school, for their children when quite young could find unskilled year-round jobs at relatively good pay.

In Roubaix boys and girls did wage labor in 1872, just as did the Gardez children of Avesnes. In the census of 1872 38.9 percent of girls and 36.5 percent of boys aged ten to fourteen listed occupations. Migrant families, recently arrived in Roubaix from areas in which they had done weaving in domestic production,

continued to see the household as a wage-earning unit, even though it had ceased to be a productive unit. Migrant families in Roubaix needed the multiple wages of several family members in order to make ends meet. Children over ten were wage earners in preference to their mothers.²²

Wives worked most commonly when there were no children in the household. But even when there were children under five in the household, wives sometimes did wage labor in Roubaix in 1872. For just that period, when most of the children were very young, was the time of greatest need for the household. Children were then consumers of goods, but contributed no wages. This was the family-cycle poverty squeeze, already noted in the family history of the Gardez. Wives in the industrial setting of Roubaix found it even more difficult to work for wages at this moment because of conflicting demands at home. Families needed wives' wage work when the ratio of consumers of workers was high--that is, when there were small children in the family. Employers' preference for young workers meant that a young wife could find work more easily than an old one. This aspect of wives' labor should not be exaggerated. It was primarily wives of ill-paid and unskilled men, or mothers in families where the male head was unemployed, who worked at this stage. Young wives with several young children at home were less likely to work than those with one. Nevertheless, those wives who did wage work when they had children under five had heavy responsibilities at home and in the factory, and the contradictions in their situation were so great that families were unlikely to see much benefit in such wage labor except in situations of real necessity.

Among young women (fifteen to twenty-five) who were wives in Roubaix households in 1872, 35 percent listed occupations, while only 8 percent of wives aged fifty to sixty did. If we look more closely at the older wives' group, another characteristic of Roubaix family life becomes evident: the large proportion of households headed by older women. Of women aged fifty to sixty living in multiple person households, 24 percent were heads of household in 1872. These female-headed households were due both to high adult male mortality and to the migration of single-parent households to the city where children could work. The household productive unit of the weaving village required an adult male member, but a household which sent its workers out to factory work did not. These family economies were likely to be fragile, as indicated by the fact that more wives worked in female-headed households than in two-spouse households. Thus an important contributing factor to older wives' labor force participation was their responsibility as heads of single-parent households.

In Roubaix in 1872, the age of marriage was later than in Avesnes. Sixty-seven percent of women aged twenty to twenty-four

were single; 33 percent of those twenty-five to twenty-nine. Over 12 percent were still single in age group fifty to fifty-four.

Children by and large lived with their parents until they married, but once they married they seldom lived in their parents' household. Eighty-six percent of female children aged fifteen to nineteen, 45 percent of those twenty to twenty-four lived with their parents in 1872. Only 2 percent of the women twenty to twenty-four living in their own households were not wives themselves in 1872.

The availability of individual wages for young people, and the separation of work place from residence thus did not lead to a period of autonomous living in most women's lives. The co-residence of adult children in their twenties with Roubaix parents offers a strong contrast with the situation in Avesnes. (It should be quickly noted that the young women of Avesnes who left their parents' households left them not for any independent living arrangement but to create another household through marriage.)

In Roubaix in 1872, as in Preston, Lancashire (1851) there was an apparently successful family effort to keep children in the household and working for the family wage fund. As Michael Anderson suggests, and as our comparison of Roubaix with the fragmentary evidence for the Avesnes weavers corroborates, parents and children lived together longer in the textile city than in agricultural or weaving villages.²³

How did families keep their children at home? The wages of children under fifteen were very low; children could not afford to live alone. Families also had resources to offer older children whose wages might be higher. In the crowded, rapidly growing city, housing was in short supply. Factory jobs provided no housing as did service or agricultural labor jobs. In working class households, non-working wives, and to a large degree working wives as well, provided services for their employed husbands and children. Wider kin networks facilitated migration, and kin or neighborhood networks of women helped people find jobs or gave aid in times of unemployment or sickness. Roubaix families had little influence over the organization of work in the city which was mostly large scale factory work, but they did have certain resources, small but evidently important, to offer their children. Most of these resources could only be enjoyed by co-resident children.

Change. Matters changed very little in Avesnes before World War I. Fertility had declined somewhat; more children were in school. But evasion of school and child labor laws was hard to control, so this legislation was not effective in Avesnes. The tragic and dramatic shock of the First World War hit the weaving

village in August, 1914, when many villagers were away in Normandy during the seasonal migration. Many others fled from the advancing Germans. Some 36 percent of the villagers of Avesnes died in the war of 1914 to 1918 and a monument commemorates those dead: 155 military, 7 civil victims, and 1,630 victims of the evacuation. Others, like Mémé and Auguste Santerre, returned to find their houses occupied by someone else, their relatives dead and dispersed, the weaving industry definitely collapsed. The Santerres, their son and Auguste's parents, returned to Normandy to work on the farm the entire year.

In Roubaix change had started earlier and was more gradual. Family strategies changed as the economic and political situation changed.

Starting in the late 1880's, fertility began to decline in Roubaix. By 1906 the child/woman ratio was halved as compared to 1872; the crude birth rate had dropped to 21.5 thousand. Family strategies had changed in response to compulsory schooling and child labor laws, changing technological demands of the textile industry, and, more importantly, better real wages for men and consequent reduced need by households for child workers. There were fewer children ten to fourteen with occupations: 15 percent of girls, 10 percent of boys. Families were investing in their children by delaying their wage labor and sending them to school longer.

Roubaix increased the number of its schools in the late 1880's and 1890's to bring the city into accordance with the law. By the end of the century its population was more often urban born. By 1906 78 percent of children under fifteen in Roubaix were in school. The short term "work not school" strategy was no longer the rule for Roubaix families.

Many more wives worked in 1906: 31 percent total average, 57 percent of very young wives, fifteen to twenty-five, and 22 percent of those fifty to sixty. The young wives who lived with their husbands and also worked had on the average half the number of children of those who stayed home, and they were much less likely to have a child under five. Fewer children born in less rapid succession, were characteristic of the families of young worker wives. The proportion of women aged fifty to sixty who were heads of multi-person households stayed about the same--23 percent. The percentage of older wives who worked in these female-headed households had increased to 64 percent. An equally dramatic increase had occurred in the number of older wives working in husband-headed households (15 percent). These older working wives had many fewer children than stay-at-home wives of the same age and status (an average of 1.3 as compared to 2.2); they had no children under 5 and many fewer of their

co-resident children were working (.8 as compared to 1.5 for non-working wives of the same age). Wives were spending more of their lives as wage workers in Roubaix in 1906, to the benefit of their fewer children, who spent more time in school and entered the labor force at a later age. In 1906 the family strategy of labor force allocation was sending wives to work rather than children.

There were similar patterns of residence of children with their parents in 1906 and 1872. The number of years of their lives in which mothers had co-resident children had not changed. The difference was that it was older mothers, those forty-five to forty-nine, who had the most resident children in their households. There were fewer children than in 1872, for marital fertility was substantially lower in Roubaix in 1906, and fertility was declining more rapidly than infant mortality.

By that year housing was less scarce in Roubaix, and net in-migration had been replaced by net out-migration. The average size of households had dropped from 4.7 in 1872 to 4.0 in 1906. Nevertheless, shared wages were still important to families. Working children paid room and board to their parents, but the convenience of lodging and services rendered by the wife and mother to family wage earners were a real resource to those wage earners. Wives performed these services for their children, sometimes holding a job themselves as well. The service aspect of the mother's contribution looks relatively more important in 1906 as compared to 1872. In a family with combined members' wages which kept it above the subsistence level, the mother was contributing to the children's and the father's expenditure for leisure or savings by providing service at little cost.

The decline of child labor and the rise of married women's labor force participation were important changes in family behavior patterns and indicators of changed circumstances in Roubaix. The corresponding decline in marital fertility meant that wives were less torn between wage work on the one hand and child bearing and care of small children on the other. Nevertheless, wives' greatly increased labor force participation in Roubaix did not affect the tendency of children to remain in their parents' household. Over her lifetime, a Roubaix wife continued to divide her activities between heavy responsibilities at home and at work.

The increased proportion of young females who lived in their own households in Roubaix in 1906 as single women, not wives, is part of a demographic pattern of change in the city. Sex ratios in the city had dropped sharply since 1872. The male to female ratio of the sample was 109 in 1872, 92 in 1906. Female nuptiality had declined. Seventy-five percent of women twenty to twenty-four were single, 42 percent of those twenty-five to twenty-nine and

19 percent of those forty-five to fifty-four. By 1906 there were many working women in Roubaix whose lives were not affected by the strategy of the family they lived with, because they did not live with their own families. In the fifteen to twenty-five age group of working women, these amounted to 3 percent living in single person households, 12.5 percent living as lodgers, servants, or other non-relative position in other households. Among working women aged fifty to sixty, 8 percent lived by themselves, 4.7 percent with non-relatives. The relatively sharp separation of home and work place in Roubaix in 1906, the low sex ratios of the city, and the availability of better individual wages meant that some women were living on their own, apart from their families. Their numbers were quite small, but the proportion is notably higher than in 1872. Whether these women's independent lives were the consequence of independence of family strategy, defiance of family strategy or acceptance of family decisions which sent them out of the household to migrate on their own to the city, we just can't know with the evidence at hand.

Conclusion. Just as there were variations of proletarianization in nineteenth century France, so in turn were there varieties of family strategies and patterns of behavior. In Avesnes-les-Aubert the Camberlots began an arduous seasonal migration in agricultural labor when local opportunities for wages to supplement their sub-subsistence weaver's earnings dried up. Wage-earning families on the sugar beet farms of Normandy continued weaver family strategies: low age of marriage; formation of a new household productive unit on marriage; high fertility; high labor force participation by children. Migrants from areas of domestic industry who moved to an industrial city with wage-earning opportunities for women and children modified their family strategies in rhythm with changing patterns of opportunities in the city. At first fertility was high and children were put to work early. Since formation of a new household was not a prerequisite for production, however, there was a strong and successful effort to keep children home with their parents, working and contributing to that family economy. With time child labor became less common in the city; some schooling was enforced by law. Although fertility declined, control over children was still the goal of parents: prolonging their semi-dependence through co-residence. The services that mothers provided their unmarried, adolescent and adult children were an important factor in the continued co-residence of those children.

Women were entwined in family strategies in both Avesnes and Roubaix. It is hard to apportion the costs of family strategies in Avesnes-les-Aubert among the individual family members. Everyone in the family was a victim--working grueling hours, eating minimal diets to make ends meet. Mothers bore many children; their daughters worked hard as children (as did their sons) and then moved into a parent/worker role. A woman whose husband did not drink or

spend sparse family earnings on his personal leisure probably spent about the same amount of time working as he did, and endured about the same amount of physical strain in a relatively equal down-trodden position.

As time passed more alternatives emerged for families in Roubaix. Mothers and children suffered the brunt of family strategy when high fertility and multiple wage earners were the family adaptation. In the later period the sacrifice of children diminished. The cost to mothers changed form but did not disappear. By 1906 women had fewer children so they had fewer child-bearing and child-care burdens. Married women were more likely to do wage work, however, so their leisure did not increase. Children were less the *victims* of family strategy, more often the *hope* of that strategy. But mothers bore the costs of their children's and their husband's leisure, and of whatever saving the family, husband and children, did.

Women who lived with their natal families as daughters in 1872 or 1906 benefited to some degree from co-residence. Any benefit, however, came at the cost of *their* mothers. These daughters submitted to some family demands, for at least part of their wages, for delay in their marriages.

The Santerre biography gives us some rare insights into the interpersonal relationships of parents and children in a situation which could be called child-sacrificing. In fact she offers two clearly contrasting cases. Her parents were tender and caring about their children, even as they involved them in the same exploitation of which they themselves were victims. The father insisted that the girls take a break in their weaving day and walk outdoors; the parents carried their exhausted daughters to bed after the back-breaking days in the sugar-beet fields. Mémé Santerre fondly recites the gay romantic songs her father sang to keep their spirits up. The father made his daughters little treats--tiny loaves of bread--when he baked the family's large loaves. The parents celebrated holidays and life transitions such as First Communion with special food for the children--an orange, a piece of special meat. Quite a contrast to the piles of cream puffs at the Communion feast described in a bourgeois autobiography from Roubaix in the same period, but sharing the same spirit of celebration of children's passage to adulthood.³³ Mémé's marriage involved sacrifice on the part of her parents, but they indulged her, as the youngest child. This indulgence was made easier by the fact that her two older sisters were still at home when she married, wearing her mother's worn silver wedding band.

Life was not so full of concern and love in all Camberlot families. In his late teens Auguste Santerre was in constant conflict with his parents. His father beat him and tried to pre-

vent his marriage. As the eldest son in a family, with ten children behind him, his wages were vital to the family and his father claimed them violently. These difficult times passed, and father and son were reconciled when a grandson was born, despite the son's defiance of his father's wishes. Families who were pursuing similar strategies could be characterized by entirely different emotional climates.

What general conclusions can we draw from these case studies of work and family in two very different sets of circumstances in nineteenth century France? First, the organization of work had a very immediate effect on many aspects of women's lives over their life cycle. As children, their access to schooling, their present and future roles as productive workers were shaped by both their family's total income needs and the demand for specific types of workers in the economy. As they became adults, the timing of women's exit from their family of birth and the timing of their marriages were both shaped by economic circumstance and by their family's needs. When they were married and had become mothers themselves, the demands on their time varied most often with their family situation, through which the economy touched them even if they were not themselves wage workers.

In nineteenth-century France, there was no single family type, no single set of goals, choices or strategies. The paths that families followed through their developmental cycles depended on their class and the structure of work in the occupations they held; the business cycle and the long term rise and decline of specific industries as well as other historical exigencies were also crucial. Patterns of family behavior are the evidence that the historian can find.

Within the patterns, there were choices. Young people chose whom they married, and sometimes this choice moved them in unexpected ways out of the familiar round of life in which they had grown up. The choice of marriage partner introduces uncertainty. So also does family choice whether to migrate or stay and make adjustments, either choice could be costly over the short run. A final illustration of choice is the allocation of surplus income among the possibly conflicting claims of family members and priorities for consumption.

Families had short- and long-term goals which were pursued in different ways according to their resources--and individual family members must be counted as resources--their location in the economy, the historic circumstances in which they lived. Changing patterns of the economy intersected with the dynamic of the family developmental cycle, with individuals entering, growing, and exiting from the family. The aggregate changes in family structure over time have been the sum of many small changes and many choices;

they represent many interrelationships, some happy and collaborative, others angry and discordant. Family structure and family strategy allowed space for values and choices even as economic circumstances constrained and limited their range.

Notes

* Some of the material in this paper appears in papers titled "Women and Family Strategies in French Proletarian Families," "Individual Lives and Family Strategies" and "Vies individuelles et stratégies familiales." The first was written while the author was a fellow at the Davis Center for Historical Studies, Princeton University. That draft was read at Yale, Livingston College (Rutgers) and the University of California, Santa Cruz. The second version was presented at a conference on Women, Work and the Family, at the Rockefeller Foundation, New York, September, 1978. The French version was presented at seminars in Lille and Paris and at the Société française d'Ethnologie, in Paris. Thanks to colleagues and audience at those presentations for questions and comments. A revised version of "Individual Lives..." was published in *The Journal of Family History* 4 (Summer 1979).

1. Serge Graftaux, *Mémé Santerre* (Verviers: Marabout, 1975), pp. 10-11, 25-26. This life story was told to a journalist by Marie Catherine Santerre in 1974, at which time she lived in an old people's home in Meaux, near Paris. Her doctor had been impressed by her stories of her life and told his journalist friend about her. Telling her life story was useful to the woman in dealing with the death of her husband and facing her own remaining years of life. Her stories about her early years are particularly vivid and clear. I have tried to verify these memories by going to the municipal archives of Avesnes-les-Aubert, the Departmental Archives of the Nord for demographic and social information about the village from the 1870's to 1914. My check of the dates in the autobiography revealed that Mémé Santerre usually had her own dates correct. She was inconsistent about how long she stayed in school, and I was unable to check that record. She gives her mother's year of birth as 1841, by several mentions of her age at dates which can be internally checked by events. This would have made her fifty at the birth of her thirteenth child. The birth register for Mémé, born in 1891, and of the registration of her marriage in 1909 show her mother's year of birth as 1848, which fits with the timing of events in her life better than the earlier date. Mémé Santerre's death is entered in the register next to her birth. She died 14 February, 1977, in the old people's home in Meaux.

2. See references below, and also Charles Blaise, *Le tissage à la main du Cambrésis. Etude d'industrie à domicile*. Lille: Vigot 1899, and *L'Echo du Nord*, 30 August, 4 September, 7 September, 11 September, 12 September, 13 September, 14 September, 15 September, 16 September, 1906.

3. Archives Départementales du Nord (ADN), M 605/4.

4. ADN M 581/141: "Enquête sur le situation des ouvriers tisseurs de département [Nord], 1878," and 8 May, 1878, Minute of Prefect of the Nord; Census summary of 1886, ADN M 473/33. Strike reports on Avesnes strikes in archives nationales (AN) F124665, 1889 and in ADN M619/7, 1889, M 625/67, 1895, and M 625/79, 1906. See also Michelle Perrot, *Les Ouvriers en Grève* (Paris: Mouton, 113, 358-359, 570, 581, 585).

5. Abel Chatelain, *Les Migrants temporaires en France de 800 à 1914* (Lille: University of Lille III, 1977), 679-680, 686-691; see also Charles-Francis Caillard, *Les migrations temporaires dans les campagnes françaises*. (Paris: Temps present, 1912.)

6. On Belgians in Roubaix, see Judy Anne Reardon, "Belgian Workers in Roubaix, France, in the Nineteenth Century," doctoral dissertation, University of Maryland, 1977, and Firmin Lentacker, "Les frontaliers belges travaillant en France: caractères et fluctuations d'un courant de main-d'oeuvre," *Revue du Nord*, 32 (April-September, 1950), 130-144.

7. The Roubaix material is part of that gathered for a larger research project comparing work, family and collective politics in three French cities, 1870 to 1914. Two papers based on this material are Louise A. Tilly, "Occupational Structure, Women's Work and Demographic Change in Two French Industrial Cities, Anzin and Roubaix, 1872-1906," ("Structure de l'emploi, travail des femmes et changement démographique dans deux villes industrielles, Anzin et Roubaix, 1872-1906"), forthcoming, *Le Mouvement Social*, 1978, and "The Family Wage Economy of French Textile City, Roubaix, 1872-1906," forthcoming, *The Journal of Family History* (special issue of Davis Center papers), 1980. Research support was provided by the Rockefeller Population Policy Program, 1974-1976, by the Rackham School of Graduate Studies, 1976-77, and by an American Philosophical Society Grant, 1977-1978.

8. Pierre Bourdieu, "Marriage Strategies as Strategies of Social Reproduction," in Robert Forster and Orest Ranum, editors, *Family and Society. Selections from the Annales* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1976), 141.

Changing Family, Changing Workplace

9. E.P. Thompson, reviewing a historical study of the family remarks that in the past, the way of living was not merely a way of surviving, but also a way of relating and valuing. He continues, "for the vast majority throughout history, familial relations have been inter-meshed with the structures of work. Feeling may be more, rather than less, tender or intense because relations are 'economic' and critical to mutual survival." "Happy Families: Review of Lawrence Stone, *The Family, Sex, and Marriage in England, 1500-1800*," *New Society*, 8 September, 1977, 501.

10. Grafteaux, 24, 51. The autobiography notes (51) that Auguste was the oldest of nine children; the census list for Avesnes-les-Aubert in 1906 (ADN M 474/38) lists eleven Santeree children, the last born in 1906.

11. Calculated from ADN, M 473/33, summary of census of 1886, which gives population by age, sex and marital status in one year cohorts.

12. See François Furet and Jacques Ozouf, *Lire et écrire. L'alphabétisation des français de Calvin à Jules Ferry*. (Paris: Editions de Minuit, 1977), 258, for comment on the damaging consequences of year round employment in industry for children's schooling. The "Enquête" of 1873 notes that among the agricultural populations around Cambrai, "progress" had occurred in instruction, but "a large number of children only attended school in the winter." (ADN M 605/67).

13. ADN M 605/4, M 625/67; Grafteaux, 24.

14. *Ibid.*, 15-16.

15. *Ibid.*, 48.

16. 1906 Census Nominal list ADN M 474/38.

17. 1886 census summary ADN M 473/33.

18. These figures and all other analyses of Roubaix statistics, unless otherwise indicated, are calculated on a ten percent sample of households in the 1872 and 1906 census nominal lists. Dr. R. Felhoen, *Etude Statistique sur la mortalité infantile à Roubaix et dans ses cantons* (Paris: Vigot, 1906), 12.

19. Roubaix, *Rapport du Maire*, 1863, (Roubaix, 1864), 7.

20. Roubaix, *Rapport du Maire*, 1864, (Roubaix, 1865), 6-7.

21. Furet and Ozouf, 257-260.

22. See L.A. Tilly, "Occupational Structure..." and "Family Wage Economy," cited above, footnote 7.
23. Michael Anderson, "Household Structure and the Industrial Revolution: Mid-Nineteenth Century Preston in Comparative Perspective," in Peter Laslett and Richard Wall, eds., *Household and Family in Past Time* (Cambridge, 1972), 233-234.
24. Fernand Motte, *Souvenirs personnels d'un demi-siècle de vie et de pensée, 1886-1942* (Lille: SILIC, n.d.), 10-11.

THE MARRIAGE ROLE: 1957 to 1976

Elizabeth Douvan
Department of Psychology
and
Survey Research Center
University of Michigan

No area of life seems to have undergone so profound a change as marriage during the last twenty years. Divorce rates accelerated steeply. One anthropologist dubbed the arising pattern "omnigamy" and claimed that divorce had become the dominant institution organizing our social life--the building block as it were, of our social organization. Our language, which has always been sparse in kinship terms, now has need of a whole new system to designate kin acquired when one remarries or when one's parents remarry following divorce. Children have a mother and father, a mother's husband, father's wife or girlfriend, new grandparents--the parents of their parents' spouses and so forth. Life is complicated and family obligations paradoxically proliferate. It is possible that divorce and remarriage represent our society's answer to the shortcomings and disadvantages of the nuclear family, a mechanism for building an extended family by choice rather than ascription. No anthropologist stranger would understand our kinship system without taking primary account of the dissolution and reformation of families.

Divorce, like psychoanalysis and psychotherapy, grew in response to cultural forces, the breakdown of certain consensual myths. The same forces which led to growing acceptance of a psychological, problem-solving frame for interpreting personal problems contribute in all likelihood to marital instability. So long as life was centrally concerned with survival, there was no time to worry about whether marriage was "fulfilling." So long as the dominant myth supported a tragic view ("There are some things which can't be changed, which one must learn to live with, everyone has some cross to bear"), the pressure for self change and marital disruption did not grow. So long as religion provided a justification for pain and an alternative system of meaning, in which withstanding suffering became credits to be negotiated in an afterlife or testified to one's virtue and one's membership in the covenant, much of one's life and social situation was taken for granted, part of life's basic reality around which adjustment was built.

But once someone said, "There is a better way to live; something can be done to change that basic reality--whether it be anxiety attacks or sexual incompatibility or a drunken husband," then no one's denial or repression was proof against erosion. Divorce, like undergoing therapy or psychological counseling, is contagious.

In this paper I will look at national data about normative attitudes toward marriage--that is, how strongly people feel that everyone should marry and the extent of moral indignation engendered by violation of the norm. Next I will look at respondents' own experience of marriage: how satisfied they are with their marriages, what they find to be the most significant gratifications and negative features of their own marriages, how they evaluate their own adequacy in the spouse role, and what problems they have encountered in marriage. Finally, I will turn to the intersection between norms and the experience of marriage, asking the question: how have changes in norms affected the way in which people live and experience their marriages?

The two studies I rely on primarily in this presentation were done twenty years apart--in the sober, conforming 50's and two years ago. The first was done by Gerald Gurin, Joseph Veroff, and Sheila Feld for the Joint Commission on Mental Illness and Health in 1957 and reported in two books: Americans View Their Mental Health and Marriage and Work in America. In the summer of 1976 Veroff, Richard Kulka, and I repeated this study with some additional questions and some revisions. In both studies some 2400 respondents chosen to represent the American Adult population living in households were interviewed about the way in which they define and live three central life roles: the work role, the spouse role, and the parent role. In addition to asking about experiences, problems, and satisfactions in these crucial areas of life, the study also included measures of adjustment, symptoms of mental health status--and questions asking people how they managed or coped with problems which arose in their lives.

Norms

On the issue of normative change, the evidence is rich and remarkably consistent. In both the 1957 and 1976 national studies, all respondents were asked: "Suppose all you knew about a man/woman (same sex as respondent) was that he/she did not want to get married. What would you guess he/she was like? In 1957 four-fifths of all respondents gave answers which indicated that they thought such a choice bad: the person was seen as either sick or immoral, too selfish or too neurotic to marry. About one-fifth gave reasons which were relatively neutral. In 1976

these figures had shifted to one-quarter negative and two-thirds neutral. That is, fewer than 25 percent of the population now think that a person who chooses not to marry must be sick or morally flawed. The weight of public opinion is now clearly on the side of neutrality. There is even a small minority of respondents in 1976 (14 percent) who view the choice positively.

Other evidence about norms: in 1957, the large majority of respondents took this sanctioning attitude toward the refusal to marry irrespective of their own marital status. That is, even people who had themselves not married or who had had bad marriages which ended in divorce (who might reasonably be expected to take a jaundiced view of the institution) overwhelmingly evaluated the choice not to marry negatively. The smallest proportion of any marital status group giving a negative evaluation occurs among single men, and here it is 74 percent. Eighty percent of single and divorced women and 92 percent of divorced men answered the question in ways indicating a negative view of people who do not marry. The uniformity of response across groups is, we think, evidence of imposing societal norms.

Jessie Bernard used the 1957 data as evidence for one of her inimitable, provocative generalizations: to wit, that marriage was good for men but bad for women. She based the assertion on symptom data and general life satisfaction, which indicated that single men had more negative mental health symptoms than married men, but that, in general, single women were more symptom-free than married women. Because there was an age bias in these findings (that is, single men are largely young men, and young men were particularly high on the "immobilization" factor in the symptoms on which Bernard's observations were based), we decided to look at attitudes toward marriage by marital status to see whether married women were more negative in their attitudes than married men or single women. We found that indeed they were, but the findings were particularly striking about single women. In every marital status in which people had experienced the married state--that is, among the married, widowed, divorced and separated--women were always more negative about marriage than men were. Only among those who had never been married were women more positive--more so than married women and more than any group except widowed men. By 1976 their positive evaluation of the married state had dropped more dramatically than any other group.

I read these findings as a reflection of the normative climate of 1957, in which marriage was defined as the only legitimate status for a woman. While married women knew that

marriage was no miraculous solution to life's problems and had its own share of burdens and restrictions, women who weren't married tended to think of marriage as a blissful, desirable state. By 1976 much fresh air and openness had been injected into discussions of marriage, and single women's idealization of marriage had disappeared. Two factors may have contributed to the idealization: on the one hand, if marriage is the only status valued by a society (particularly for women) and refusal of marriage is thought to reflect on one's good sense or morality, then obviously unmarried people will want to marry. Unmarried women who in fact might have preferred the single state may also have been reluctant to admit their preference or reveal in any way that they rejected the idea of marriage. In 1957 women were certainly under intense normative pressure to marry in order to realize legitimate femininity, and women who were not married idealized the married state because they wanted very much to achieve it. When normative pressure relaxed, they could look at marriage as one possible course but not the only or ideal way to live.

One other indication that the norms for marriage are neither as strong nor as absolute as they once were is seen in responses to a question which asked in a rather long-winded way: "Is divorce ever a good solution to marital problems?" Twenty percent of respondents said that divorce was never a good solution--they apparently believed that marriage is an absolute and indissoluble commitment. But 80 percent think that at least under some conditions, divorce is the best path.

Pro-natal norms have also declined. People in a national sample are now essentially neutral in response to a young couple who decide never to have children. They are not as likely to see childlessness as either neurotic or morally reprehensible as people did in earlier studies.

So family norms have softened. But we must remember that norms tell us about people's expectations of the behavior of others; they are abstract. When we look at people's own behavior, we find that most people do marry and have children, and that they value these choices they make.

One derivation and series of findings I would like to add before I leave the data on norms: if norms soften and people are more tolerant toward a variety of life styles, one might expect that the negative effect of choosing a deviant (i.e., non-normative) life style would also diminish. The evidence we have indicates, however, that this is not so. In 1957 two groups in the population showed notable symptoms of stress: divorced women and single men. We had thought some of this stress--any part attributable to a sense of deviance and normative

pressure--might have ameliorated with a change in norms. But in fact our data reveal that in 1976 single men and divorced women are still exceptionally stressed (Table 1). Either a time lag is required for changed norms to translate to the particularity of the individual's psychological state or--more likely--the stress of these positions comes from forces other than social norms. The divorced woman--particularly if she is raising children alone--faces realities like poverty and role overload which are so oppressive that they make social stigma pale by comparison.

The unmarried male in our culture has still not experienced a socialization which prepares him with adequate social and interpersonal skills to create and maintain a reasonably integrated and satisfying life with people on his own--that is, without a wife to initiate and maintain friendships and kinship ties.

The Experience of Marriage

Aside from questions having to do with norms and a generalized view of marriage and its meaning, there is notable stability in the structure of family attitudes. Unlike the area of work where relationships among attitudes show some striking variations from 1957 to 1976, the relationships among marital happiness and problems, happiness and the sense of adequacy in roles remain essentially the same over the generation. Relationships between these attitudes and demographic factors like age and education change little in direction even when the magnitude of the relationship changes. We interpret this stability as a reflection of salience. Presumably attitudes are more coherently structured around objects, goals, and values which are more important to one's adaptation and life, and stability of structure reflects this same importance.

We have other indications of the centrality of family roles. In one series of questions we asked respondents to choose from a short list of Rokeach end values those they thought were most important in their own lives. They were next asked how much each of the life roles and leisure and housework contribute to the realization of their highest value. Family roles almost uniformly rate higher in value production than the job role does. There are one or two exceptions--for example, older women say that the job allows them a lot of self-actualization, more so than marriage. And it is partly the rareness of this ordering which lends it a certain weight. But even in this case, parenting yields more self-actualization than the job. When the same analysis is restricted to people who occupy all three roles, women never rate the job more fulfilling than family roles and men (only older men) do so only for self-actualization and

security. In most cases the job is only half or two-thirds as high as one or the other of the family roles.

Another series of questions asked respondents to choose between two fixed alternatives: "Which of these would you rather overhear someone say about you?"

She/he is a fine mother/father	OR	She/he is excellent at her/his work
She/he is a good wife/husband	OR	She/he is excellent at her/his work
She/he is a good wife/husband	OR	She/he is a fine mother/father

Either family role, pitted against work, yields a ratio in favor of family larger than three to one. This dominance of family roles over work is the same for males and females. Within the family sphere, the spouse role dominates over the parent role in a ratio of three to two for men and slightly less for women. This series seems to us to touch very close to the core sense of self, that aspect which carries central significance or meaning. Clearly for both men and women that significance attaches to family more than it does to work.

The fact that people value their family attachments and hold them central to self-definition does not, of course, mean that marriage and parenthood are without problems and conflict. In 1976 our findings reveal a significant increase in people's awareness of marital stress and of the fact that family roles involve problems and burdens as well as satisfactions. Respondents were asked "How is the life of a man/woman changed by being married?" In 1957, some 42 percent of the national sample gave answers which indicated a view of marriage as enlarging the individual, opening new opportunities (e.g., "makes a person more mature"; "gives a person a goal in life"). About 20 percent responded negatively to the changes brought by marriage. Among respondents who had experienced marriage, a positive view was even more common, accounting for more than half of all responses given by married, widowed, and divorced people. In 1976, in contrast, less than a third of all respondents (29 percent) offer such a positive view of marriage and almost as many reveal a distinctly negative view of the changes marriage brings (24 percent). In 1976, respondents are much more likely to answer in ways that emphasize the burdens and restrictions marriage imposes rather than the opportunities it offers.

The year in which the interview was taken accounted for a full 30 percent of the variance in the responses of single women. In discussing norms, I interpreted the finding about the attitudes of unmarried women--particularly what seemed to be an idealization of marriage in 1957--as revealing something about the stringency of pro-marriage norms in our society at that time. It seems important to note, however, that if unmarried women are by and large young women, the changes in their attitudes toward marriage and children could have major significance for social change in the future. This is, one might say that young unmarried women were traditionally idealistic about marriage and mothering and that it was this idealism which insured that they would marry and have children in sufficient numbers to insure societal continuity. It could be especially critical that the young women were turning away from traditional institutions. And, while our data indicate that the young were always somewhat less positive toward marriage and parenting than older people (a dissonance phenomenon?), the gap does seem to have grown.

Among people who are currently married the following question drew the largest difference over time: "Even in cases where married people are happy there have often been times in the past when they weren't too happy--when they had problems getting along with each other. Has this ever been true for you?" The difference here is that respondents in 1976 are more likely to say that they have at some point had problems in their marriage. The difference is larger for men than for women (38 percent in 1957 and 58 percent in 1976 for men; 49 percent and 62 percent for women).

Now this shift in men's response to experiencing marital problems might mean several things. It might indicate that males have come to be more open--with themselves and with interviewers--about negative feelings, complaints, and problems. In general we know--from our own studies and from other research about health and mental health--that women are more aware of the internal world, of the reality of feelings and fantasy. Yet the increase in men's report of marriage problems stand out: they do not show the same large increase in problems in the role of parenting or work. It seems to be a real finding which reflects real stress.

When, however, we look at questions about happiness in marriage and the sense of adequacy in the marital role ("Almost all men feel that they are not as good husbands as they would like to be. Have you ever felt this way?"), we find that there has been no decrease in people's feelings of adequacy, and a rather strong trend toward increased happiness in marriage.

(One might immediately think that the increase in marital happiness is an artifact of the higher divorce rate in 1976--that the people who are unhappy in marriages are less likely to stay in those marriages today than they were 20 years ago. But an analysis of first and later marriages does not support this interpretation--the increase occurs equally in each kind of marriage from 1957 to 1976.)

The combination of stress and happiness is not necessarily contradictory. Indeed, throughout the earlier study awareness of problems and gratification in a role tended to be associated, as though recognition of problems reflected in part a more articulated and larger set of expectations in various roles--as though holding more demanding criteria also implied a larger capacity for gratification in the role. If all you want from a marriage is lack of conflict--a bland smooth interaction--you can, of course, have this by reducing interaction to a minimum.

Norms and Experience

A trend in the culture which will appear again and again in interpretations of findings from this research has to do with a decrease in sensitivity and allusion to status and roles in various aspects of life. Meaning and self-definition no longer derive primarily from the accession to adult status and the adequate or outstanding performance of adult roles. In fact, role and status designations have become objects of suspicion, as though they were different from and even contradictory to the core self, the essential person. (The feminist movement objects to use of "Miss" and "Mrs." as titles, pointing to the fact that marital status is used in a non-symmetrical way to define women but not men. The use of status titles like Doctor, Professor, and inquiry about the vocation/profession of an individual on first encounter are considered bad form, somehow contravening genuine response to an interest in the core of the person so designated or questioned. Any allusion to status is taken as a preoccupation with status and disregard for personal, egalitarian, human values. Reflecting an interest in what a person does (in the vocational realm) is taken as preoccupation with status and a disinterest in the authentic, the essential, the personal qualities and style of that person.

Interest in position can be corrupted into status preoccupation; however, it does not invalidate the knowledge a person has of her/his position in a social structure. Since Veblen's time at least, the connection between what a person does for forty or more hours a week in work and the ways in which that person will structure perception, knowledge, meaning,

and relationships has been noted and studied by social scientists of various disciplines and persuasions. If a man spends most of his waking, attending hours thinking of human beings as resources to be deployed in the winning of wars, or as objects to be manipulated in the service of business profit, this activity will in all likelihood influence the way in which he relates to his children, his wife, his friends. What a person does is related to what he is--in his core.

Even knowing that a person is married tells something important about the authentic self of that person. In our society with wide dissemination of statistical data about marriage and divorce rates, it means at least that the person is probably an optimist about the future of social arrangements and has a capacity to commit herself to human relationships which on their face are full of risk. Whereas in other eras security needs might be inferred from the act of marrying, at the moment it is probably closer to the truth to read verve, omnipotence, and bouncy optimism into the act.

The paradoxical truth is that disregard for position, which is urged as a counterthrust to formalism and status consciousness in order to enhance close interaction between people, actually increased distance between people by insisting that they turn inward for the derivation of meaning and self-definition. It places the burden of self-definition entirely on the individual--and makes it a matter of individual achievement rather than a consensual and shared reality. No longer do we allow the individual to derive some of his sense of self and legitimacy from a position in a social structure. Rather, he must rediscover meaning in the spring of his individual detached self each day. Individual achievement becomes the whole story, and urges distance from rather than connections to structure or to others.

None of this is to deny that preoccupation with status can be dehumanizing. The person who can only see others as representatives of status categories, who cannot relate to the personhood, the reality of a secretary or plumber or grocery clerk, or refers to "my little seamstress" or "little butcher," surely dehumanizes those others with whom he/she interacts. If all we ask is what a person does in the occupational world, we fail to know the other. If we judge people by the criterion of status we lose the color and richness of human personality. But the misuse of knowledge does not contradict its validity. Status, position in a social structure, connections to group and to other people are valid and informing facts about an individual and they have traditionally signified meaning to the individual and to others about the individual's self. People

do not play roles in quite the way that the implied analogy to theatre conveys. We play roles but our roles also enter, and alter, ourselves. In a real sense we become our roles, not just to an audience but also to ourselves, and aspects of the self which are role-derived (an American painter, a painter, a husband and father) are less authentic and usually more central to self-definition than those aspects based on extra-role dimensions (tall, nearsighted, melancholy, cheerful). They are aspects of the self, and they are facts of interest to anyone who would know the self.

When status and roles are discredited as legitimate information about people, they lose their meaning and their capacity to lend meaning to people's own lives and self-definitions. Christopher Lasch and other social critics have attributed divorce and family breakdown to narcissism, the rise of a new dominant character type which is borderline, disorganized, seeking immediate gratification.

My reading of the situation is less individual, less psychological, less motivational. From our data I conclude that the failure of relationships does not indicate that people no longer want or value family relationships. Rather it seems to me they value such relationships highly, want stable relationships keenly, but can't realize them because the social structure offers no normative support, no clear instrumentality for such relationships.

While there is plenty of strain in contemporary families, most people nonetheless place their emotional chips there. Most people recognize that life is at best a lonely trip. Those relationships which affirm the self, can survive conflict, and allow expression of the whole self are an enormous help in supplying comfort, meaning, pleasure, gratification, anchors for the self. People have not drastically let that reality slip or lost track of that core area of significance.

Table 1

Relationship Between Marital Status and Well-Being, Symptoms by Sex and Year

	Married Men		Married Women		Single Men		Single Women		Widowed Men		Widowed Women		Divorced Men		Divorced Women	
	1957 (944)	1976 (686)	1957 (960)	1976 (732)	1957 (82)	1976 (125)	1957 (75)	1976 (125)	1957 (47)	1976 (43)	1957 (232)	1976 (253)	1957 (40)	1976 (86)	1957 (111)	1976 (174)
1. Overall Happiness																
a. Very happy	36%	34%	43%	40%	11%	26%	27%	27%	13%	14%	19%	20%	22%	15%	18%	13%
b. Not too happy	8	8	7	6	12	11	11	14	40	21	24	19	20	19	27	20
2. Anxiety																
a. Low (5 + 6)	34	24	25	14	35	28	27	20	39	26	23	18	43	17	24	10
b. High (12)	13	10	24	25	5	15	15	25	24	11	36	29	13	16	28	33
3. Immobilization																
a. Low (3)	50	36	45	40	36	26	55	33	76	55	75	61	53	24	49	38
b. High (7)	14	18	18	18	20	34	19	23	7	7	7	8	28	29	24	21
4. Health Symptom																
a. Low (6)	47	35	35	32	44	42	49	39	28	23	19	17	45	33	39	25
b. High (15)	16	20	24	28	20	16	19	28	40	40	44	50	15	20	24	32
5. Nervous Breakdown																
a. Yes	11	12	25	25	13	19	17	24	11	22	22	21	15	23	28	37

The Marriage Role

CHANGES IN THE SEX ROLE ATTITUDES OF WOMEN, 1962-1977:

EVIDENCE FROM A PANEL STUDY

Arland Thornton
Institute for Social Research
University of Michigan

and

Deborah Freedman
Department of Economics
University of Michigan

A central feature of most societies has traditionally been a division of labor and authority between men and women. Which tasks are assigned to males and which to females has varied widely, but in Western societies sex roles have been primarily distinguished by a division between family and occupational roles.

Recent decades in the United States have witnessed not only important changes in the distribution of occupational roles between men and women but significant change in other aspects of family life. While men have continued to specialize primarily in occupational roles outside the home, married women increasingly have combined paid employment with their traditional homemaker roles. The age at marriage has risen, and so has the divorce rate. The fertility rate has declined sharply, and educational attainment has increased. Meantime, the women's movement has focused attention on the sex-based assignment of tasks, authority, and status with the goal of changing the attitudes of both men and women and providing a wider range of opportunities for women. Since the attitudes and beliefs of men and women about what constitutes an appropriate division of labor and authority between the sexes tend to be consistent with the existing division of family and occupational roles, it is likely that the recent changes in family life and the distribution of occupational roles have been accompanied by shifts in attitudes about appropriate sex roles, with people becoming more tolerant of women occupying roles previously held by men. The increasing levels of education and the rise in the women's movement also should be linked to changes in beliefs and attitudes concerning the role of women.

The questions we ask in this paper are: in what ways and to what extent have sex role attitudes changed in the fifteen years between 1962 and 1977?

Data. The data used for this analysis were collected in five waves of a longitudinal survey of the same women between 1962 and 1977. The sample represented, on a stratified probability basis, white women in the childbearing ages living in the Detroit metropolitan area, who either had just married or had just had a first, second, or fourth birth with approximately equal numbers of first, second, and fourth parity women and a somewhat smaller number of just married women. Within stratum the women were chosen by simple random sampling from the birth and marriage records of the Detroit area.

The first interview, an eighty minute personal interview with 1,304 women (representing a response rate of 92 percent) collected a considerable body of information on the demographic, economic, and social characteristics and attitudes of the respondents.

Follow-up interviews were obtained by telephone in the fall of 1962, and again in 1963, 1966, and 1977. Of the 1,304 original respondents, full interviews were obtained in 1977 with 1,161 or 89 percent. A comparison of the 1977 sample with the original 1962 respondents indicated that the overall characteristics of the continuing 1977 group were only slightly different from the original sample.

Survey Questions. In the original personal interview in 1962 respondents were asked to respond to the following series of statements concerning the appropriate division of labor or authority between men and women:

Now, I would like to get your opinion on some matters concerning family life. I will read you some statements, and I would like you to tell me if you strongly agree, agree, disagree, or strongly disagree. The first is:

1. Most of the important decisions in the life of the family should be made by the man of the house (DECISIONS).
2. It's perfectly all right for women to be very active in clubs, politics, and other outside activities before the children are grown up (WOMEN ACTIVE).
3. A wife shouldn't expect her husband to help around the house after he's come home from a hard day's work (HOUSEWORK).
4. There is some work that is men's and some that is women's, and they shouldn't be doing each other's (MEN'S/WOMEN'S WORK).

Although the respondents were asked to respond in terms of one of the four agree-disagree categories, the few who insisted that they were undecided, didn't know, or that it depends were coded into a fifth category.

Summary of Findings. The data document the tremendous shift which women have made toward more egalitarian sex role attitudes between 1962 and 1977. As expected, the recent decline in fertility and the increases in education, female employment, and divorce have been accompanied by an increasing rejection of traditional definitions of the appropriate division of labor and authority between men and women. Whereas in 1962 between 32 and 55 percent of the respondents gave egalitarian responses concerning various sex role attitudes, by 1977 these percentages ranged from 60 to 77 percent. This trend towards egalitarian sex role attitudes cannot be explained by the maturation of these women; age was not positively related to egalitarian attitudes at either date. Thus the attitudinal shift over the 15-year period reflects changing conditions between 1962 and 1977 rather than the aging of the panel members.

The shift towards egalitarianism is considerably more pronounced for the two global items of the survey concerned with the general principles of role segregation and division of authority within the home, than for more specific aspects of role specialization, such as the sharing of housework or the legitimacy of nonhome activities for mothers. One possible explanation could be that the general trend toward more egalitarian attitudes about appropriate roles for men and women becomes somewhat tempered when specific activities are concerned--activities with which these women have been involved for a considerable number of years.

The group of women surveyed who were between the ages of 15 and 39 in 1962 had their children during the baby boom; and although most of them have worked some time in their life, only 50 percent have worked two and a half years or more during the past 15 years. Thus, like most American women bearing their children during the baby boom, this group have spent most of their married lives taking care of the home and children while their husbands supported the family. The realities of allocating work and home responsibilities undoubtedly have made them more aware of the problems involved in shifting responsibilities for specific home tasks even though they may in principle support equal prerogatives for men and women as well as more equal sharing of family and occupational roles. Since the survey data showed that these women performed most of the home and child care tasks, their lesser shift on attitudes regarding specific tasks may reflect the actual sex role division within their households.

Why Attitudes Change. In 1962 sex role attitudes bore no appreciable relation to a wide spectrum of individual characteristics, including age, education, religion, number of children, work experience, husband's education, and husband's income. By 1977 many of these basic characteristics were related to sex role attitudes and were shown to be important determinants of changes in attitudes between 1962 and 1977. Younger women, those with more education, those with better educated husbands and those who were working in 1962 were more likely than others to adopt egalitarian sex role attitudes, while mothers of large families and fundamentalist Protestants tended to retain traditional sex role attitudes. The exposure to a wide spectrum of ideas which education and work experience bring apparently made these groups of women more receptive to attitudinal changes than others.

The experiences of the women during the 1962 to 1977 inter-survey period also were associated with a shift in sex role attitudes. Additional education, work for pay, and exposure to divorce were associated with shifts toward egalitarian attitudes, while additional births were associated with remaining traditional.

Thus the data reported in this paper are consistent with the general proposition that the recent changes occurring in the American family have been accompanied by shifts in the attitudes of American women. The recent increases in female education, female employment, divorce, and the decline in fertility have been accompanied by increasing rejection of the traditional definitions of the appropriate division of labor and authority between men and women. In addition, the data indicate that the characteristics and experience of the individual women are related to their attitudinal changes. Those with access to non-traditional ideas and opportunities, both in terms of their 1962 characteristics and their experience between 1962 and 1977, underwent the largest number of changes. Quite clearly the attitudes and behavior of American women are linked together in important ways.

REFERENCES

- Andrews, F.M., Morgan, J.N., Sonquist, J.A., and Klem, L.
Multiple Classification Analysis. Ann Arbor: University
of Michigan, Institute for Social Research, 1973.
- Bayer, A.E. "Sexist Students in American Colleges: A Des-
criptive Note." *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 37:
391-397, 1975.
- Bowen, W.B. and Finegan, T.A. *The Economics of Labor Force
Participation*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press,
1969.
- Boyd, M. "Equality Between the Sexes: The Results of Canadian
Gallup Polls, 1953-1973." Paper presented at the annual
meetings of the Canadian Sociology and Anthropology
Association, 1974.
- Bumpass, L.L. "Fertility Differences by Employment Patterns and
Role Attitudes." In C.F. Westoff and N.B. Ryder, *The
Contraceptive Revolution*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton
University Press, 1977.
- Bumpass, L.L. and Mason, K.O. "U.S. Women's Sex-Role Ideology,
1970." *Journal of Sociology*, 80:1212-1219, 1975.
- Cain, G.G. *Married Women in the Labor Force*. Chicago: Univer-
sity of Chicago Press, 1966.
- Cancian, F.M. "Mass Media Coverage of Women: Changes from
1965-74." Stanford, CA: Stanford University, Dept. of
Sociology, unpublished manuscript, 1975.
- Erskine, H. "The Polls: Women's Roles." *Public Opinion Quar-
terly*, 34:275-290, 1970.
- Ferree, M.M. "A Woman for President? Changing Responses: 1958-
1972." *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 38:390-399, 1974.
- Goldberg, D. "Modernism: The Extensiveness of Women's Roles and
Attitudes." *World Fertility Survey Occasional Paper No. 14*,
International Statistical Institute, 1974.
- Goldberg, D. "Socioeconomic Theory and Differential Fertility:
The Case of the LDC's." *Social Forces*, 54, 1975.

Changing Family, Changing Workplace

- Hoffman, L.W. "Effects of the Employment of Mothers on Parental Power Relations and the Division of Household Tasks." *Marriage and Family Living*, 22:27-35, 1960.
- Hoffman, L.W. "Employment of Women and Fertility." In L.W. Hoffman and F.I. Nye, *Working Mothers*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass, 1974.
- Mason, K.O., Czajka, J. and Arber, S. "Change in U.S. Women's Sex Role Attitudes, 1964-1974." *American Sociological Review*, 41:573-596, 1976.
- Parelius, A.P. "Emerging Sex-Role Attitudes, Expectations, and Strains Among College Women." *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 37:146-153, 1975.
- Roper Organization, Inc. *The Virginia Slims American Women's Opinion Poll. Vol. III: A Survey of Attitudes of Women on Marriage, Divorce, the Family, and America's Changing Sexual Morality*. New York: The Roper Organization, 1974.
- Scanzoni, J. *Sex Roles, Life Styles and Childbearing*. New York: The Free Press, 1975.
- Sweet, J.A. *Women in the Labor Force*. New York: Seminar Press, 1973.

HIGH SCHOOL SENIORS' PREFERENCES FOR

DIVISION OF LABOR IN THE FAMILY--1977

A. Regula Herzog, J. G. Bachman and L. D. Johnston
Survey Research Center
University of Michigan

How do high school seniors regard their future roles as husbands and wives, and how do they anticipate dividing the major duties between themselves and their partners? The findings presented here are based on questionnaire responses by 2500 or more male and female high school seniors in 1977 and form part of the "Monitoring the Future" national sample, administered each year by the University of Michigan Survey Research Center.

Most of the seniors of both sexes (approximately 75 percent in our study) are planning to get married and think it likely that they would want to have children, with two children the norm. But only a small number of the female seniors (approximately 10 percent) expect to be exclusively homemakers at the age of 30; most of them expect to be involved in some sort of paid work at that point in their lives.

How then do these seniors of both sexes expect to combine the major functions of homemaker and worker in the female role, and to what degree do they anticipate modifying the male role in order to accommodate such changes? Do these young adults reflect in their expectations the clear trend in our society for married women to join the labor force even when they have preschool children at home?

These issues were addressed with a set of questions in which several possible arrangements for division of work between husband and wife were probed and each could be rated as either "desirable," "acceptable," "somewhat acceptable," or "not at all acceptable."

Division of paid work. Rated most often as desirable for couples without children is either a half-time or a full-time working wife in combination with a full-time working husband. The arrangement in which the husband works full-time and the wife half-time (rated by only 4 percent as not at all acceptable) seems to represent a compromise between traditional and egalitarian arrangements which is at least somewhat acceptable to almost everybody. The completely egalitarian arrangement,

however, in which both partners work full-time is not universally accepted; about 20 percent of the seniors rate it as not at all acceptable.

The traditional arrangement of a full-time working husband and a non-working wife is rated less desirable and less acceptable than these other two arrangements. Only 9 percent of the seniors rate it as desirable and a total of 25 percent rate it as not at all acceptable. Finally, the sex role-reversed pattern in which the husband works less than full-time while the wife works full-time is clearly rated as least desirable and even largely unacceptable.

Responses to these questions do reflect sex differences: the male seniors are always somewhat more conservative than the females. Across all the different types of ratings slightly higher proportions of males than females endorse the traditional arrangement, (that is, the husband working full-time in paid employment, the wife devoting her full-time to homemaking). At the same time fewer males endorse the egalitarian arrangement (where husbands and wives share equally in paid employment and in homemaking.)

Couples with pre-school children. The picture changes quite dramatically when the couple is assumed to have preschool children--and the majority of the seniors indicated that they do expect to have children. For this family situation the non-working wife is clearly preferred over all the other possible alternatives. However, it is interesting to note that although very few seniors actually desire any arrangement in which the wife works, less than 20 percent of them would find unacceptable a wife who works half-time when she has young children. Clearly rejected, on the other hand, is a full-time working wife. Once again the male seniors responded somewhat more conservatively than the females.

Division of child care. Assuming a couple in which the husband works and the wife does not hold a job, the seniors still favor an equal division of child care between husband and wife over any arrangement giving either parent primary responsibility. This strong preference seems rather surprising, and it is certainly not in line with an equity norm by which the non-working wife would be expected to assume the heavier child care load. Perhaps this clear preference for parental sharing reflects the value placed on fathers' as well as mothers' involvement in child-rearing. (It is also possible that the expression "child care" may have been interpreted as meaning only time spent in direct interaction, play, and the like, rather than the

entire range of duties involved in feeding, clothing and caring for children.)

When both partners are assumed to be working full-time, the preference for equal division of child care after working hours is indeed overwhelming. Some 40 percent of the seniors consider such an arrangement as desirable and almost nobody (4 percent) judges it as not at all acceptable.*

In contrast with the egalitarian division of child care, all the remaining arrangements involving unequal division were considered less desirable and less acceptable. If the division is to be unequal, however, it is the wife who is more frequently expected to assume major responsibility--even in situations in which both partners are holding full-time jobs.

Sex differences, although small, point again to higher proportions of males as conservative.

In sum, our data show a clear preference for child care performed in equal parts by both parents. Even in the case where the wife does not have a job, seniors rate an egalitarian arrangement as preferable over arrangements involving one parent predominantly or exclusively.

Division of housework. Asked about the division of household chores when both partners work, the seniors' responses were similar to the responses for child care for a working couple. Again they preferred an egalitarian division of housework over other arrangements, and only very rarely was that pattern judged not at all acceptable. When these responses are compared with preferences for child care in which both partners work, the major difference lies in the somewhat lower percentages of seniors who rate the egalitarian arrangement as desirable and the somewhat higher percentages who rate the major or exclusive involvement of the wife as acceptable.

This difference may have to do with the nature of the tasks. While the quality of child care presumably benefits from the involvement of both partners, the quality of the housework appears much less dependent upon such shared attention and may thus be assigned on more stereotypical basis. (The difference in responses may also reflect the formulation of the question, since housework was defined as "things like cooking, cleaning, and laundry," all tasks typically assigned to females, and typically male responsibilities such as mowing the lawn, minor repairs, etc., are not mentioned.)

*In this latter situation, unlike the previous one, child care was defined as care after working hours and on weekends. This rewording was done to avoid creating several logically impossible situations, but it has obviously produced questions that are not completely comparable.

What then are the conclusions to be drawn from the responses?

Preferences are moderately egalitarian. The high school seniors of 1977 appear quite open to the sharing of family and work responsibilities. Most of them would accept or even desire that a wife should participate full-time or half-time in paid employment if she had no children. Even assuming the presence of young children, quite a few seniors would accept at least half-time work by the mother. In the areas of child care and household duties, responses of the seniors were even more egalitarian. Not only did the seniors opt for husband-wife sharing of duties in the family situation where the wife is assumed to have a full-time job, but they also preferred the sharing of child care between parents in a family situation with a non-working mother. While the seniors to a very considerable degree support egalitarian arrangements, the data by no means reflect a complete abandonment of the more traditional sex role distinctions. Many seniors still prefer a non-working or a half-time over a full-time working wife. Where a couple is assumed to have preschool children, it is the wife who is expected to drop out of the labor force. Moreover, although the preferences for child care reflect a strong focus on the egalitarian alternative, considerable numbers of seniors would still find it acceptable if the wife performed all or most of the child care.

Effect of children on employment preferences. Despite the observed tendencies toward egalitarian division of labor and in particular toward equal sharing of child care, the arrival of children affects only the preference pattern for the wife's but not the husband's paid work. While for a couple without children, half-time or full-time work by the wife seems acceptable or even desirable, for a couple with one or more preschool children a nonworking wife seems most desirable (although half-time work is also quite widely accepted for a mother of young children). In clear contrast to the effect on women's work patterns, preferences for men's work are very little affected by the presence of young children. For the husband to work less than full-time meets with little acceptance. Moreover, both male and female seniors share these views, pointing to a general agreement about the differential modifiability of work patterns due to child rearing responsibilities.

The male and the female work role. For childless wives full-time, half-time or no employment are all options that are at least somewhat accepted by over 75 percent of the seniors. For wives with young children the alternatives are somewhat more limited: only no employment or half-time employment are widely accepted. A completely different picture emerges for

the husband. A majority of the seniors accept only full-time work for the husband; no more than 25 percent are able to accept the part-time alternatives (except for half-time work by a childless husband).

Support for sex role reversal. The reluctance of the seniors to accept sex role-reversed division of labor seems to amount to more than a simple rejection of the sex segregated division of labor, since we generally observe more acceptance of sex-segregation in tasks that are assigned in the traditional way. In other words, we observe more acceptance of working husbands, and more acceptance of wives doing most or all of the child care and housework than husbands doing most or all of it.

Sex differences. Overall, and perhaps surprisingly, relatively few large sex differences are apparent in these data. Most differences that are notable are fairly small but also quite consistent: female seniors are less likely to be conservative in their preferences for allocating various types of family responsibilities between themselves and their future husbands, but tend more towards egalitarian arrangements. On the other hand, they are very similar to males with regard to reversed sex role preferences: nearly all seniors of either sex consider unacceptable any arrangements in which males work less than full-time or take on most or all responsibility for child care and housework.

The consistent tendencies for slightly more males than females to be conservative in their attitudes toward division of labor in the family should not, however, overshadow the major thrust of our findings which lies in the similarity between male and female preferences. It thus seems doubtful that the level of sex differences observed in our data is large enough to produce widespread and fundamental disagreement about the respective roles between specific partners.

In the 1977 "Monitoring the Future" instrument, seniors were also asked to comment on the following item on sex role attitudes: "It is usually better for everyone involved if the man is the achiever outside the home and the woman takes care of the home and the family." In their responses 53 percent of the seniors agreed, another 15 percent gave a "neither agree nor disagree" response, and only 32 percent disagreed. In other words, the responses reflected considerable conservatism among the seniors. However, we know from the data reported here that seniors can respond considerably more liberally, given the chance to rate specific family situations and particular duties. In our view, the use of more specific questions has resulted in a more refined understanding of the preferences of high school seniors for the division of work and family roles than has been possible with the more global attitudinal items.

COMBINING FAMILIES AND CAREERS:

VIEWS FROM DIFFERENT POINTS OF THE LIFE CYCLE

Jean D. Manis
Center for Continuing Education of Women
University of Michigan

Hazel Markus
Department of Psychology
and
Center for Continuing Education of Women
University of Michigan

Two of the most striking demographic trends in American society since the 1950's have been the movement of women of all ages into the labor force, and the recent sharp drop in the birth rate.

What have these historic changes meant in the lives of the women who have lived through them? How have they integrated their career experiences with traditional cultural expectations that they be mothers and homemakers, and with their own expectations concerning these more customary roles? To what extent are family and career roles seen as in conflict, and to what extent are they seen as compatible? In exploring these questions, we will examine both cohort differences, by comparing the attitudes of three different age groups of women, and life cycle differences, by comparing attitudes about different points of women's lives.

Characteristics of Women in Study.^{1/} The data in this paper are based on a survey of 1,145 women who came to the University of Michigan Center for Continuing Education of Women between 1964 and 1973. The 10-page survey covered their educational, work and family histories, and their attitudes about the inter-relationships of these different parts of their lives.

These women, who were interested in beginning, continuing or completing college or graduate education when they came to the Center, are not, of course, representative of the population as a whole. Seventy-three percent of the women are working; of these, 61 percent are working full-time. Their age range is from 22 to 83, with approximately one third under 35, another third between 35 to 44 years old, and the remaining third 45 or more. Three-fourths of the women say that they think of themselves as having

or planning a career: 87 percent of the under-35 group, 80 percent of those between 35 and 44, and 59 percent of the oldest group. About half the women have had interruptions of five or more years in both their educational and their work histories. Three-fourths of them are married; 15 percent are divorced; and 9 percent never married. Their husbands are heavily represented in the professions, with 30 percent holding Ph.D. degrees. A third of the women who have ever married have two children, 23 percent have three, and 17 percent have four or more.

With respect to educational attainment, about a third of the women have a four-year college degree; an additional 43 percent have Master's degrees, and another 9 percent have high-level professional degrees--Ph.D., law, medicine, or M.B.A. If you take into account the educational goals of those who have not yet completed their education, then approximately one-fourth of the women either have or aspire to a high-level professional degree--Ph.D., J.D., M.D., or M.B.A. Approximately 20 percent received their highest degree when they were 40 or more years old; 46 percent were 30 or more when they received their last degree.

Home-to-career Transition. Since so many of our respondents--whatever their early education and work experience--had followed the traditional pattern of marrying, having children, and spending a period of years as full-time homemaker before returning to school and/or work, they seem to be an ideal group for studying the effects of the transition into the career role. How does this transition affect a woman's self-definition and her view of the relative rewards and importance of family and career concerns?

In our analysis of the data which we have reported elsewhere,^{2/} we looked at the effects of career orientation on self-esteem and at the relationship between age and career attitudes. The younger women show a higher degree of career orientation, as measured by a set of items designed to tap the relative importance of career and family concerns, as well as by their answer to the direct question about whether they thought of themselves as having a career. The career-oriented women showed higher self-esteem than did the non-career women. However, self-esteem was not related directly to age but rather was related to work experience, with the women who were working full-time at relatively higher salaries showing the highest self-esteem, and those who were not working showing the lowest.

This study will examine the women's attitudes toward combining work and family roles. The next phase of the CEW study will analyze the actual patterns of work experience, as

part of an assessment of the process of career development for these women.

The presentation of our findings is divided into three sections. First, we will analyze the attitudes of the career-oriented women, since they may be the most sharply engaged in dealing with the conflicts between the two roles, and because we want to examine differences by age among women who think of themselves as having or planning a career. Then we will compare these responses with those of the women who say that they do not think of themselves as having a career. To what extent are these non-career women interested in both roles, and to what extent do they perceive conflict? We will also contrast the non-career women and the career women, with a special subset of the career women--those who have gone the farthest in their careers.

Finally, we will turn to a different set of items, to see what the women say about what they would do differently if they could start all over again. In this way we will have a sense of how the different options have been evaluated in the past and how the women now feel about the choices they made over the course of their lives.

Attitudes about Home, Career. To define women's attitudes toward combining career and homemaker roles, we asked respondents to recall their attitudes at different ages in their lives, and to predict their attitudes for the future. The question reads as follows:

We are interested in what your attitudes were about combining career and homemaker roles at different ages in your life. The statements below reflect different attitudes about these problems. For each of the five ages below, check the one attitude which best represents how you felt at that age. (Try to estimate what your attitude will be, for those ages beyond your present age.

We asked them to give their attitude at five different ages--15, 25, 35, 45, and 55. The statements described seven different attitudes about combining the two roles:

No clear attitude about combining career and homemaker roles

Primarily interested in one role--homemaker

Primarily interested in one role--career

Table 1

ATTITUDES AT DIFFERENT AGES ABOUT HOMEMAKER AND CAREER ROLES
(Career-Oriented Respondents)

Attitude	Current Age 22-34				
	15	25	35	45	55
No clear attitude about combining roles	53.6%	2.1%	.4%	.4%	.4%
Homemaker role more important than career	16.9	28.8	22.7	7.7	2.4
Interested in both-see no conflict	13.6	20.5	35.2	51.5	53.2
Interested in both-unsure how to resolve	6.4	23.6	28.2	13.8	10.9
Career more important than homemaker role	9.5	25.0	13.6	26.5	33.1
N	295	288	273	260	248

Attitude	Current Age 35-44				
	15	25	35	45	55
No clear attitude about combining roles	57.5	5.6	-	-	-
Homemaker role more important than career	20.1	59.5	33.1	13.3	6.3
Interested in both-see no conflict	8.9	12.7	22.6	40.3	47.3
Interested in both-unsure how to resolve	3.5	10.7	31.0	16.7	6.3
Career more important than homemaker role	10.0	11.5	13.3	29.6	40.1
N	259	252	248	233	222

Attitude	Current Age 45-64				
	15	25	35	45	55
No clear attitude about combining roles	64.6	4.3	1.1	-	.6
Homemaker role more important than career	12.2	74.2	68.0	26.7	8.6
Interested both-see no conflict	7.9	5.9	11.6	38.9	46.3
Interested in both-unsure how to resolve	2.1	4.8	14.4	11.1	9.3
Career more important than homemaker role	13.2	10.8	5.0	23.3	35.2
N	189	186	181	180	162

Interested in both; in case of conflict
the homemaker role would take precedence

Interested in both; no conflict anticipated

Interested in both; unsure how to resolve
conflicts

Interested in both; in case of conflict the
career would take precedence.

In other words, for each respondent, we have five variables, reflecting their attitude at the five ages we asked about.

We cannot, of course, say to what extent the attitudes as measured here are accurate reflections of how the women actually felt at the different ages. It may be that we all engage in a process of revising our histories to fit our current values and situations. But while these biases and other problems of recall may have an effect, we do not believe that they could reasonably be assumed to account in any major way for the patterns we see in the data.

Career-Oriented Women. In analyzing the responses of the career-oriented women, we will discuss them by the current age of the respondents. Table 1 (p.54) is divided into three panels, one for respondents age 22 to 34 years old, one for those whose current age is 35 to 44, and one for those age 45 to 64. To clarify the presentation, by reducing somewhat the number of figures to be considered, we have combined some of the attitude choices in these tables: the attitude which is here described as "homemaker role more important than career" includes both the "primarily interested in one role--homemaker" and the "interested in both; in case of conflict the homemaker role would take precedence" options. Similarly, the "career more important than homemaker role" includes both the "primarily interested in one role--career" and the "interested in both; in case of conflict the career would take precedence" choices.

First of all, considering the attitudes at age 15--the first column in Table 1--note that over half of the women, whatever their current age, said that they had no clear idea about combining the two roles. Since that response essentially drops out after that--that is, it is rarely used to describe the other ages--we think this choice can be taken as meaning that this was simply not a salient issue for them at that age; they just weren't thinking about it, one way or the other.

Changing Family, Changing Workplace

In discussing the attitudes at ages past 15, we will start with the older women, those in the bottom panel of the table, in order to preserve the proper historical sequence. (In other words, a 50-year-old woman describing her attitude at age 25 is talking about an earlier point in history than a 25-year-old woman--who is, of course, dealing with the present time.)

Looking at the bottom panel of the table, then, and looking at their attitude at age 25--the second column of figures--note that 74 percent say that the homemaker role was more important to them. Nearly as many women (68 percent) say that they felt that way at age 35. At age 45, however, they indicate a sharp change in attitude: the figure for the "homemaker role more important" drops to 27 percent; nearly 40 percent say that they were interested in both and anticipated no conflict, and 23 percent say that they were primarily interested in the career role. This trend becomes even more evident at age 55, with the "both--no conflict" response reaching 46 percent and the "career more important" becoming the next most common response, for the older women. Perhaps for this transitional generation the "empty nest" may be more of an adjustment for the husband than for the wife: she welcomes the freedom to give more attention to her career, and he is the one who suddenly feels that there's nobody home.

Turning to the women who are currently 35 to 44 years old--the middle panel of Table 1--note that approximately 60 percent say that at age 25 they considered the homemaker role most important. However, only a third say that they felt that way at age 35. Nearly as many say that they are interested in both, but are unsure of how to resolve the conflicts. More than 20 percent say that they are interested in both and anticipate no conflict. When they are describing age 45, 40 percent of them predict that the "both--no conflict" option will describe them, and 30 percent choose the "career more important" description. Again for age 55 these two choices become more popular.

When we look at the women who are less than 35 years old, we note a much greater dispersion of opinion with respect to the attitude at age 25. In other words, there is no consensus of opinion as there was among the older groups of women. Less than 30 percent say that the homemaker role is more important to them; 25 percent say that the career role is more important; and nearly as many indicate that they are interested in both roles but are unsure of how to resolve any conflicts. Referring to their attitudes at age 35, 35 percent of them predict that the "interested in both--no conflict" description will fit them best, but 28 percent still choose the "unsure how to handle conflicts." When they are estimating their attitude at age 45,

51 percent choose the "no conflict" option. By age 55, according to their estimates now, only two percent will regard the homemaker role as the more important of the two, and one third assume that the career role will be more important to them.

Several general points seem in order. First, whatever their current age, these women are pretty much in agreement that by the time they reach their late forties, early fifties, the homemaker role will not take precedence over their career interests. They have not swung to an extreme position the other way; slightly more than a third of them overall say that the career will take precedence (28 percent of those who are currently married); nearly half of them are saying that they will be able to manage both with no great conflict.

(Obviously, different women may have very different strategies in mind for achieving this "no conflict" situation: some will not seek employment at all until later in life; some will limit their employment to part-time; among those who are working full-time, especially in the more demanding positions, there is probably a continual process of reassessment of what tasks are truly essential, in both roles; and there may be a similar process of reallocation of responsibilities between spouses, as the two careers move through different phases.)

Second, all three groups see the mid-thirties as the age of greatest conflict--or at least the period when they are most unsure of how to handle the conflict. (In other words, in each panel the highest figure for the "interested in both--unsure how to resolve conflict" option appears for age 35.) This makes sense in terms of parental responsibilities: most women who intend to have children will have them by that age, and all who have had them will still be involved with them at that point. In addition, for these "transitional" generations--that is, these women who are moving from homemaker-only to career roles without a clear-cut societal acknowledgment or legitimation of this pattern--this may be the period when they are most likely to be engaged in sorting out their priorities and goals.

Thirdly, it is interesting to note that the older women are generally the least apt to choose the "unsure how to handle the conflict" option. This reflects the fact that through age 35, they continued to give the homemaker role priority. Then, by age 45 and on, they move to the "both--no conflict" description. Among these women then, whatever the difficulties of establishing a career later in the life cycle, the process may have been less conflicted than it is for the younger women, who

are faced with trying to establish families and careers at the same time, while receiving a more mixed cultural message as to what their priorities should be.

Finally, there is clearly both a cohort effect on attitudes (which can be seen by comparing attitudes for a given age--age 25, for example--over the three current-age panels), and a change in attitudes over the life cycle, which can be seen by looking at attitudes across the different ages we asked about, within each panel.

Comparison with Non-Career-Oriented Women. Let us turn now to a consideration of the differences between these career-oriented women and women who say that they do not think of themselves as having a career, and between the entire group of career-oriented women and a smaller subset of them, those who are working full-time and earning \$17,000 or more per year. (The modal salary for women working full-time was about \$16,000, with a considerable clustering around the \$15,000 to \$16,000 range; we picked the \$17,000 as the point where there was noticeable drop in frequencies, but still enough cases beyond that point to analyze.)

These comparisons for the first three ages we asked about are shown in Table 2. For each of the three ages--age 15, age 25, and age 35--the first column gives the attitudes of those who are working full-time and earning \$17,000 or more; the second column gives the attitudes for all career-oriented women (including those we have shown separately in the first column); and the third column gives the attitudes of those who say that they do not think of themselves as having a career. These three groups might be thought of as roughly forming a continuum, with respect to degree of career orientation.

Looking first at the data for the younger women--the top panel in Table 2--and looking at the attitude at age 15, one can see that the higher the degree of career orientation and commitment, the less likely the women are to give the "no clear attitude" response: 70 percent of the non-career women choose this description, compared to 54 percent of the career-oriented, and 39 percent of those who are working full-time at the higher salaries. Note that the more successful career women are not saying that the career was more important to them at that point; rather, they seem to be indicating that they were aware of the issue, and are more likely to give one of the other more specific options about combining the two roles--including the choice that the homemaker role was more important to them.

Table 2

ATTITUDES AT AGES 15, 25, and 35 BY CAREER ORIENTATION AND AGE

Attitude	Current Age Less Than 35								
	Age 15			Age 25			Age 35		
	Working Fulltime, \$17,000+	All Career-Oriented ^a	No Career	Working Fulltime, \$17,000+	All Career-Oriented ^a	No Career	Working Fulltime, \$17,000+	All Career-Oriented ^a	No Career
No clear attitude	39.3%	53.6%	69.6%	3.7%	2.1%	4.3%	- %	.4%	- %
Homemaker > career	28.6	16.9	13.0	7.4	28.8	34.8	4.2	22.7	54.5
Both--no conflict	17.9	13.6	4.3	22.2	20.5	13.0	33.3	35.2	22.7
Both--unsure how to resolve	10.7	6.4	-	37.0	23.6	21.7	29.2	28.2	22.7
Career > homemaker	3.6	9.5	13.0	29.6	25.0	20.1	33.2	13.6	-
N	28	295	23	27	288	23	24	273	22
Current Age 35-44									
No clear attitude	47.2	57.5	71.9	5.4	5.6	3.2	-	-	-
Homemaker > career	17.0	20.1	15.6	30.4	59.5	83.9	15.1	33.1	65.5
Both--no conflict	15.1	8.9	6.3	19.6	12.7	-	26.4	22.6	13.8
Both--unsure how to resolve	7.5	3.5	3.1	17.9	10.7	6.5	35.8	31.0	17.2
Career > homemaker	13.2	10.0	3.1	26.8	11.5	6.5	22.6	13.3	3.4
N	53	259	32	56	252	31	53	248	29
Current Age 45-64									
No clear attitude	62.7	64.6	69.0	1.9	4.3	1.6	-	1.1	-
Homemaker > career	11.9	12.2	19.0	75.9	74.2	75.4	61.0	68.0	83.3
Both--no conflict	8.5	7.9	3.4	11.1	5.9	6.6	16.9	11.6	8.3
Both--unsure how to resolve	-	2.1	1.7	-	4.8	3.3	15.3	14.4	5.0
Career > homemaker	16.9	13.2	6.9	11.1	10.8	13.1	6.8	5.0	3.3
N	59	189	58	54	186	61	59	181	60

^a Figures in the "All Career-Oriented" columns are based on all the respondents who described themselves as having or planning a career; they thus include most of the women who are shown separately in the "Working Fulltime, earning \$17,000 or more" columns.

Changing Family, Changing Workplace

Describing their attitudes at age 25 and at age 35, the younger non-career women, as one would expect, are more likely to give the "homemaker role more important" and less likely to give the "career more important" choices than are the other two groups.

Looking at the attitudes at age 25, for the younger women, note the sharp difference between the women working full-time at the higher salaries ("FTHI's") and the larger group of career-oriented women with respect to the percent choosing the "homemaker more important" role (7 percent vs. 29 percent). Notice that this is partly because the FTHI's show a much higher proportion than the other groups saying that they are interested in both, but unsure how to resolve the conflict (37 percent compared to 24 percent of the overall group).

At age 35 the striking difference in the percent choosing the "homemaker role more important" is still evident. The figures for the "no-conflict" and "unsure" choices are very similar for the FTHI's and the larger career group, but now the FTHI's are much more likely than the other groups to say that the career role is more important.

The data for the women who are now 35 to 44 show a generally similar pattern, and we will not comment on them specifically.

When we look at the figures for the women who are 45 or older, one can see immediately that, with respect to their early attitudes (particularly their attitude at age 25) career orientation makes little difference: about 75 percent, whatever their work status, say that at age 25, the homemaker role was more important to them.

In summary, then, for the women in the first two age groups--those under 35 and those 35 to 44--it appears that the higher the degree of career orientation, the earlier in their lives the women showed awareness of the issue of combining the two roles. Furthermore, the higher that degree of career orientation, the more likely the women were to hold attitudes which gave the career at least equal weight, and the sooner they moved toward regarding the career as more important.

Attitudes of Older Non-Career Women. We would like to comment now on the attitude of the non-career women with respect to the later ages we asked about--ages 45 and 55. These data are in Table 3, (p.61), which shows the attitudes at all five ages for the career and non-career women. If one looks at the attitudes at the older ages--at age 45 and at age 55--one sees that the non-career women move toward the same "interested in

Table 3
ATTITUDES AT DIFFERENT AGES BY CAREER ORIENTATION AND AGE

Attitude		Current Age Less Than 35									
		Age 15		Age 25		Age 35		Age 45		Age 55	
		Career-Oriented	No Career	Career-Oriented	No Career	Career-Oriented	No Career	Career-Oriented	No Career	Career-Oriented	No Career
No clear attitude		53.6%	69.6%	2.1%	4.3%	.4%	- %	.4%	- %	.4%	- %
Homemaker > career		16.9	13.0	28.8	34.8	22.7	54.5	7.7	40.0	2.4	20.0
Both--no conflict		13.6	4.3	20.5	13.0	35.2	22.7	51.5	35.0	53.2	45.0
Both--unsure how to resolve		6.4	-	23.6	21.7	28.2	22.7	13.8	15.0	10.9	5.0
Career > homemaker		9.5	13.0	25.0	26.1	13.6	-	26.5	10.0	33.1	30.0
N		295	23	288	23	273	22	260	20	248	20
		Current Age 35-44									
		Age 15		Age 25		Age 35		Age 45		Age 55	
		Career-Oriented	No Career	Career-Oriented	No Career	Career-Oriented	No Career	Career-Oriented	No Career	Career-Oriented	No Career
No clear attitude		57.5	71.9	5.6	3.2	-	-	-	-	-	-
Homemaker > career		20.1	15.6	59.5	83.9	33.1	65.5	13.3	19.2	6.3	20.0
Both--no conflict		8.9	6.3	12.7	-	22.6	13.8	40.3	34.6	47.3	44.0
Both--unsure how to resolve		3.5	3.1	10.7	6.5	31.0	17.2	16.7	30.8	6.3	12.0
Career > homemaker		10.0	3.1	11.5	6.5	13.3	3.4	29.6	15.4	40.1	24.0
N		259	32	252	31	248	29	233	26	222	25
		Current Age 45-64									
		Age 15		Age 25		Age 35		Age 45		Age 55	
		Career-Oriented	No Career	Career-Oriented	No Career	Career-Oriented	No Career	Career-Oriented	No Career	Career-Oriented	No Career
No clear attitude		64.6	69.0	4.3	1.6	1.1	-	-	-	.6	1.9
Homemaker > career		12.2	19.0	74.2	75.4	68.0	83.3	26.7	48.1	8.6	37.7
Both--no conflict		7.9	3.4	5.9	6.6	11.6	8.3	38.9	29.6	46.3	43.4
Both--unsure how to resolve		2.1	1.7	4.8	3.3	14.4	5.0	11.1	14.8	9.3	9.4
Career > homemaker		13.2	6.9	10.8	13.1	5.0	3.3	23.3	7.4	35.2	7.5
N		189	58	186	61	181	60	180	54	162	53

both--anticipate no conflict" choice that the other women do: 45 percent of the non-career women, whatever their current age, say that at age 55 they will be interested in both, with no conflict anticipated.

The other point we would like to make about these data is this: recall that we earlier pointed out that the "interested in both--unsure how to handle the conflict" response tended to be given most often as a description of age 35, among the career women. We saw in Table 2 that for the younger FTHI's, this description was given most often for age 25. Here, in Table 3, one can see that for the non-career women, aged 35 or more, this choice appears most often at age 45.

In other words, most of our respondents, whether they think of themselves as having a career or not, deal with the issue of combining these two roles at some point in their lives. Those who have gone the farthest in establishing careers outside the home have faced, and to a certain extent resolved the issue earlier than the other women of their age.

Women's Self-Assessment of Life History. Thus far, we have been describing the women's attitudes at various points in their lives, as they recall them now or as they estimate they will be. We would like to say something now about their current views. As they look back over their own personal life histories, how do they evaluate this process of combining family and career roles? Do those who have moved into careers regret the early years of involvement in the home? Are those who have not moved in that direction content with their lives? As the last question in our survey, one which served in many ways as a summary of what the women had been talking about throughout the questionnaire, we asked: "If you could start all over again, what would you do differently, if anything, about: a) getting an education; b) planning a career; c) getting married; and d) having children?"

First, the overall figures: 70 percent of the women said that they would do something different about getting an education, if they could start over. Sixty-three percent would do something different about planning a career. Forty-one percent would do something different about marriage (the figure is 37 percent of those who are currently married, and still in their first marriage). And 38 percent of the women say that they would do something different about having children. (The figure is 42 percent for those married and still in their first marriage.)

What would they do differently, and how are their responses related to age and work status? First, with respect to education: the most common response--given by 30 percent of the

women--was that they would finish their educations sooner. Sixteen percent said that they would give greater consideration to employment concerns--a response given most frequently by women who are not working now. Fifteen percent mentioned a specific field that they would take up, if they could start over; nine percent say that they would have gotten a more advanced degree than they now have; and 10 percent say that they would finish their education before marriage and children.

It is the more successful career women who are most likely to say that they would have gone into a specific field ("If I were starting out today, I'd go to law school") or that they would get a more advanced degree than they have. These are the responses of able women, who, although they have been relatively successful in the terms of this sample and in view of the societal expectations of them nevertheless recognize that they have the ability and aptitude for higher level professional positions than they now hold. It is the women who are not working now, or who are working part-time in ordinary jobs, or full-time in lower paying jobs, who say that they would finish their education before marrying or having children, or that they would avoid a certain field.

With respect to careers, the three most common responses (each given by roughly 25 percent of the respondents) were that they would think about or plan a career sooner, that they would have avoided a certain field or gone into a different field, and that they would have tried to get more career guidance. (There is a good bit of comment about the lack of career guidance for women when they were in high school and college, or about how bad it was, where there was any.)

It is the younger women who are most likely to say that they would have avoided a certain field, or gone into a different field, and that they would have sought more career guidance. The women in the middle age ranges--35 to 54--are the most likely to say that they would think about a career sooner, and 10 to 12 percent of them also say that they would go to work, or back to work, sooner. Of the women 35 or older, 10 percent say that they would plan a career, if they were starting over; these are women who have described themselves as not having a career. About four percent of the women say that they would delay having children until they had started on their career. Interestingly, practically none of the women who are working full-time at the higher salaries say this; rather, this comment is made most frequently by women who are working part-time in routine jobs.

The most common response with respect to marriage was that they would wait longer before marrying. Of the women under 45, over a fifth said that they would wait longer. (The national

figures for age at first marriage were dropping for these cohorts; our respondents are saying that this wasn't a very good idea.) Five percent of our respondents specifically commented that they would wait until they had lived independently before marrying. Four to five percent, at all ages, said that they might not marry at all.

Thirteen percent of the women--and nearly 20 percent of those under 35--said that they would wait longer before having their first child. Seven percent said that they might have no children, six percent said that they would have fewer than they did, and six percent said that they would have more. In all, 14 percent of the women commented, in discussing one or another of these four areas, that they would finish their education, or get started on a career, before they married or before they had children.

In looking back over their lives, the women who have gone the farthest with careers are the least apt to say that they would do something differently about any of these four areas. It is the women who are not working, or who do not have good jobs, who are more likely to say that they would do something different, particularly about getting an education and planning a career. That their current frustration reflects real-world differences in life histories can be shown in simple demographic statistics: the women who say that they would wait longer to marry did indeed marry earlier than the mean for this group. The women who say that they would wait longer to have their first child had their first child at an earlier age than did the rest of the women in the sample. Those who say they would have fewer children have larger families than the other women. Those who say that they would finish their education or get started on their careers before marrying and having children are less likely to have a college degree than the other women, or, if they have a B.A., they earned it at a later age than did the other women. In other words, it is the women who have not achieved the career norms for this group, rather than those who have exceeded them, who say that they would do things differently. Their responses illustrate once again the negative impact on women's earnings of early marriage, early childbearing, and truncated education.

There is one other example of this demographic corroboration of the attitudinal data which we would like to mention. You will recall that for women who are 45 or older, their descriptions of their attitudes at age 25 were not related to their current work status. If you look at mean age of marriage by current work status for these women, there is no difference. However, among the women who are 35 to 44, and among those younger than 35, those who are now working full-time at the higher salaries

married later than did the other women. This seems to us an interesting behavioral corollary of the difference in attitudes at age 25, which we described earlier.

Further evidence of how the women feel about their lives today can be found in the responses to the following question: "Taking your day-to-day life in general, are you doing all the things you would like to be doing?" The women working full-time at the higher salaries were the most likely to say yes; those working full-time at the lower salaries were least likely to say yes, followed by those who are not working. (For those who said that they were not doing all that they would like to, we asked what was missing in their lives; among the women who are not working, the most frequent response was "a job.")

Which Group is Happier? In other words, the women who have successfully moved into careers appear overall to be happier with their lives than the women who have not--in part because a good many of those who have not done so would like to, but are in circumstances which make it difficult to do so. Very few of our respondents indicate that they would forego the satisfactions of marriage and children for the satisfactions of a career. But they do suggest that another time around they would start sooner and aim higher, or in a different direction toward a career goal that would enable them to function at a level requiring their fullest capacities and talents--and which would permit them to reap appropriate rewards, in terms of level of salary and societal esteem, for their efforts.

NOTES

1. For a fuller description of the sample, see Jean D. Manis, "CEW's Study of the Transition from Education to Employment: A Description of the Sample," paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Association of Women Deans, Administrators, and Counsellors, March 30, 1978, Detroit, Michigan.
2. Jean D. Manis and Hazel Markus, "Careers and Career Attitudes: Age, Education, and Timing Effects," paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, August 30, 1978, Toronto, Canada.

WORK, STRESS, AND SOCIAL SUPPORT

Robert L. Kahn
Institute for Social Research
University of Michigan

"Family and Work"-- the focus of this group of studies-- is a topic on which little research has been done. The lack of such research cannot be explained on the grounds that the dual subject is unimportant or that its two components are unrelated; a different kind of explanation is required. Sociologists of knowledge concern themselves with such questions, asking why certain kinds of knowledge are prized at certain historical times and places, while other knowledge is little valued. Every society sets its own priorities in the search for understanding, and reveals much about itself in the process. A review of research on work suggests a concern with material output and organizational success rather than the quality of the work experience or its relationship to family life.

Let us be more specific. There is a long tradition of research on work, and a review of it suggests four main emphases. First, there is a great deal of research on the physiological capacity, and to some extent the mental capacity, of people for work. Time study, machine design, and human engineering illustrate this emphasis. Second, a good deal of research has been done on problems of persuasion and motivation to work. Examples include research on supervisory behavior, on leadership patterns, and on various techniques for increasing worker performance. Third, there is research on the measurement of work--usually in relation to some external standard of what work ought to be done. Research on quality control, on the setting of production goals, on the analysis of absence and tardiness, and the like would fall in this category. Finally, there is a great deal of research on problems of selection and placement--fitting people into jobs which they can perform competently. These four lines of research share a common orientation. All ask about the contribution of the individual to the organization--what that contribution can be, should be, or has been.

There is another and complementary line of research on work which is much more recent and much less developed. It asks what effect the job is having on the well-being of the individual. Some of this research concentrates on problems of exposure to toxic materials and other physical hazards. Some of it, including that which my immediate colleagues and I are concerned with, concentrates on problems of stress in the work place, methods of reducing stress and ways of coping with stresses that cannot be reduced.

The family has been paid little attention in all this. The possibility that work has effects on the ability of the worker to perform the

roles and functions of spouse, parent, neighbor, friend, or citizen, has been little looked at. Indeed, when the family has entered into work research at all, it has been regarded as a competitor for the time and energy of the worker or as a potential source of difficulty on the job. For example, the main activity which was undertaken by the Western Electric Company, following that classic series of experiments that have come to be known as the Hawthorne studies, was an intensive program of interviewing, the purpose of which seems to have been the identification of "off the job" events which were interfering with "on the job" performance. Family concerns are prominent in the reports of those 21,000 interviews, but interpreted always in terms of their impact on the job. That the demands of the job might interfere with family life seems not to have concerned the architects of that research or at least its appliers.

My colleagues and I are trying to redress the balance by studying the stresses of work and their ramifying consequences for other life domains. We define the term "stress" in terms of what has been called the "engineering analogy"; stress is defined as an external force directed at some object or person, and strain is defined as the effect of stress. That is, the damage, the distortion, the alteration in mood, or other negative response that stress evokes, we refer to as strain. In recent years we have begun to learn something about the stresses of work and their ramifications. I will illustrate that claim by describing one sequence of researches on stress, one buffer against stress, and two proposals for increasing the compatibility of work and family life.

Stress at Work

The following sequence of studies has been chosen to illustrate one of the processes of research development--the differentiation of stresses. To each finding identifying a particular event or condition at work as stressful, we ask the question "why." Why does that particular stressor produce the observed signs of strain? What is it about the stressor that makes it stressful? How can its stressful qualities be more precisely identified? The progression from one research project to the next reflects the persistent process of asking such questions about each set of research results and then attempting to design the next project to answer them.

This series of studies began with research on role conflict (Kahn, et. al., 1964), which we thought of initially as consisting of incompatible demands on the job. We assumed that the demands on a person made by others in the work situation--supervisor, peers, and subordinates--might be incompatible and that their incompatibility would be experienced as stressful. We studied such problems of role conflict intensively for 53 jobs ranging from first-level supervisor to corporate officer. For each job selected for intensive study, we interviewed not only the person holding the job but also the set of other people who held jobs directly related--as supervisors or managers, co-workers, or subordinates. In the language of role theory, we would say

that for each role, interviews were taken with the focal person and with the members of that person's role set. Information from these interviews allowed us to compare the expectations that the members of each of the 53 role sets had for its focal person, and thus to measure the degree of role conflict or consensus that person encountered on the job.

The effects of role conflict defined in that way are varied, but they are consistently negative. People whose jobs were subject to high role conflict were more likely to be experiencing job-related tensions, symptoms of sleep difficulty or digestive discomfort, and feelings of anxiety. Their job satisfaction was lower than that of people whose jobs were less subject to role conflict. They had less trust, respect, and liking for the people who surrounded them and with whom they were required to interact at work. This syndrome was particularly common at the boundaries of organizations, where the individual had to deal simultaneously with the expectations of insiders and outsiders, people who often represented two sets of interests, two organizational sub-cultures.

Most of the conflicts reported in that first study were hierarchical, not in the sense that supervisors were solely responsible for them, but rather that the parties to the conflict were likely to include the supervisor. And many of the conflicts could be labelled temporal; they were conflicts in which the incompatible role expectations had to do with time rather than ethical issues or organizational goals. That finding was unexpected, and emerged from later analyses of the conflict data (Sales, 1969). We had been thinking of role conflict in more dramatic terms and had been looking for expectations that were logically or morally incompatible. The research results from the conflict study and a related national survey told us that most conflicts at work are of other and more pragmatic kinds.

As a result, the next study in this series concentrated on role overload, disagreement about the amount of work to be done, the commitment to do it, and the time available for its completion. The subjective aspect of such conflicts, as measured in a national study of sales representatives (Kraut 1965), involved the feeling of not being able to finish one's work in an ordinary day, or the sense that getting through the amount of work to be done conflicted with doing it as well as it should be done. Another manifestation of overload, of course, would be the feeling that the requirements of the job interfere with those of life roles away from the job.

And that of course led to the third study in the series, where the question was not merely the fact of overload but exactly what there was too much of. If half the people in the country are recording role conflict in some significant degree and if the majority of those who report role conflict feel the conflict around the time dimension, what is being pressed on them which is being reported as overload? We came to distinguish between quantitative overload and qualitative overload.

A study on that problem was done at a university where, with the permission of the people who fell into the sample, we were able to use data from the staff medical examinations to look at physical effects as well as self-reported effects of quantitative and qualitative overload.

We thought of quantitative overload in terms of a dimension that ranges from having too much to do to having too little to do, and qualitative overload on a dimension that ranges from having work that is too difficult to do to having work that is too easy and essentially uninteresting. These two types of overload have some similar and some disparate effects (French, Tupper, and Mueller, 1965). For example, both quantitative and qualitative overload were related to job tension, but their relationships to self-esteem were more specialized. Quantitative overload was related to low self-esteem among administrators but not among professors. Qualitative overload, on the other hand, was related to low self-esteem among professors but not among administrators.

The fourth of the studies in this series was done at Kennedy and Goddard Space Flight Centers, where it was possible to obtain detailed information of physiological responses to overload (Caplan, 1971). Twenty-two men were observed at work for periods of two to three hours on each of three days. Their heart rates were recorded telemetrically during the same period, and their cholesterol levels were determined daily. Findings indicated substantial agreement between subjective overload as reported by the individual, and objective overload as measured by number of telephone calls and visitors. Both subjective and objective overload were related to heart rate and to cholesterol level. Moreover, the pattern of time pressure, interrupted work, relatively rapid pulse rate and elevated cholesterol level was more characteristic of administrators than of scientists or engineers.

The final step in this sequence of refinements was made by Sidney Cobb (1974), who proposed that responsibility should be distinguished from overload of other kinds and that a further distinction should be made between responsibility for things (money, equipment, etc.) and responsibility for people (work schedules, rewards, future careers, etc.). Cobb found some connection between responsibility for people and certain coronary risk factors. For example, diastolic blood pressure was positively associated with the amount of time people said they spent on exercising responsibility for the futures of others but not with other aspects of responsibility. A similar relationship was found between cholesterol level and self-report of time spent exercising responsibility for others' futures. Both these findings held only for persons who showed certain aspects of what has been called the Type A personality--especially involved striving and persistence.

These relationships were found in the data from Goddard and Kennedy Space Flight Centers, to which we have already referred. They led Cobb to look at other research on occupations in which responsibility for persons was characteristically heavy.

He initially considered three professions: medicine, dentistry, and law. Within each of those professions, if you order the specialties according to their apparent responsibility for people's lives and well-being, you will also have rank-ordered the specialties in the profession with respect to the incidence of coronary heart disease among the people who practice it. In medicine, dermatologists and pathologists have far less coronary heart disease than surgeons and general practitioners (one-third to one-half; Russek, 1960). Among dentists, orthodontists and periodontists are apparently freer of coronary heart disease than are dental surgeons and dentists in general practice. In law the odds favor those who are doing patent law and estate work rather than criminal trials and general practice.

Such findings led Cobb to a prospective study in which he chose a group of people in an occupation which has a conspicuous and dramatic kind of responsibility for the welfare of others--air traffic controllers. In a comparative analysis of 4,325 air traffic controllers and 8,435 "second-class airmen," Cobb and Rose (1973) found persistent differences in the frequency of certain diseases that are clinically considered to be stress-related. Hypertension is four times more common (point prevalence) among air traffic controllers than among the second-class pilots, who must pass essentially the same physical examinations conducted by the same set of physicians.

Diabetes and peptic ulcer are more than twice as common among air-traffic controllers as among the second-class airmen. All three diseases--hypertension, diabetes, and peptic ulcer--show earlier ages of onset among the air traffic controllers than among those airmen who eventually get any one of them. Furthermore, two of the diseases--hypertension and peptic ulcer--show a traffic effect. That is, if you first rank-order the airports in the country according to the amount of traffic and then according to the probability of the air traffic controllers getting one or another of these diseases, you find that the two rank orders bear a significant resemblance to each other.

This sequence of researches has been selected from a larger set of studies to illustrate the process of research development from one project to the next, and the concomitant refinement of concepts and explanations. In the examples we have reviewed, the progression is from relatively undifferentiated notions of stress to increasingly specific concepts--from role conflict to overload, from overload in general to quantitative and qualitative forms of work load, from work-load as such to the distinction between activities and responsibilities, and from responsibilities overall to such specifics as responsibilities for people versus responsibilities for things.

The choice of conflict and overload as examples of stress was also made for its potential relevance to the sometimes competing claims of work and family, which must be resolved within the individual limits of time and energy. We should not leave the impression, however, that the stresses of work can be understood merely as conflict and overload.

All of work stress is not overload. Indeed, if we want to understand the stress of work in many jobs, we need to think simultaneously of overload and what seems at first glance to be its opposite--underload or underutilization. Many jobs use far less than the abilities and interests of the people who perform them. In the nationwide studies which we have done in the Survey Research Center on the meaning of work, when we ask people what they consider most important in a job, the factor of challenge comes first. It is rated most important and it is cited most often as an area of deficiency.

I believe that a combination of overload and underutilization is unhappily characteristic of many jobs in advanced technologies, and little work has been done on overload and underutilization in combination. One of the exceptions to this statement, and a very good one, is provided by research conducted in Sweden about three years ago by Bertil Gardell and his colleagues. They were dealing with two groups--a risk group and a comparison group--in mills and lumber trimming plants, part of an industry that has had a substantial technological development.

The risk group was composed of people on jobs with extremely short operating cycles, usually less than 10 seconds before the cycle had to be repeated. There was almost total dependence on machines (saws, edgers, trimmers, etc.) for determining work pace; there was a necessity for sustained positional and postural constraints, and there was a need for unremitting attention because of the possibility of accidents with sharp power tools. The comparison group consisted of people in the same community, the same industry, and with the same kinds of rewards but with jobs that did not make the same technology-defined demands. Gardell and his colleagues followed both groups of people closely. They took urine specimens and blood samples several times a day, so that they could follow the physiological stress reactions of each individual throughout the daily cycle. They were particularly interested in the excretion of adrenaline and noradrenaline as indicators of physiological stress.

The risk group, those people who were in the machine-paced jobs, had a secretion rate of adrenaline and noradrenaline during the work day that was about one and a half times their resting rate (a rate taken at home substantially after their work day had ended). The control group showed an adrenaline rate during the day which was not significantly different from its base rate for the most part. The pattern of difference during the work day is even more revealing. The control group begins the day with an excretion rate which is about at resting levels; the excretion rate peaks early as the rhythm of the work asserts itself, and then there is a gradual winding down to an end of the day reading which is just about the same as the rest level. By contrast, the workers who were on the machine-paced short-cycled jobs show very high anticipatory stress. They begin the work day with something near twice their resting level of adrenaline and noradrenaline; after an initial period that looks like adjustment to the demands of the job early in the morning, they

show increasing signs of strain. Their peak reading, which is more than twice their base level of adrenaline and noradrenaline, occurs at the very end of the work day. This pattern fits their statements of reluctance and anxiety about going to work, the anticipatory peak of strain as the work day begins, and the avoidance of social activities for some length of time after work.

As one of them said, "It takes at least a few hours to get all that work rhythm and noise out of your system before you feel up to being with the family or anybody else." For these workers the combination of overload and underutilization on the job constitutes a continuing loss to family life.

Social Support

Let us turn to the question of social support, which can be regarded as one relatively effective buffer against some of the stresses of work. By social support I mean the feeling that we are esteemed, respected, liked, valued, cared for by others whom we care about. Social support implies a kind of membership, if you like, in a network of persons who share feelings of that kind and the obligations that go with them. We have found in a number of studies that the relationship between stress and strain was reduced when social support was strong.

For example, in describing the research in the space flight centers, I mentioned that administrators tended to have higher blood pressure, higher glucose levels, and higher serum cortisol than the engineers or research scientists. They were also more likely to be cigarette smokers and were more likely to have tried to quit smoking and failed. All of these inferred stress effects are modified by the presence of social support. The tendency of people in administrative jobs to show these kinds of strain symptoms are reduced or eliminated among administrators whose subordinates, co-workers, and supervisors are supportive in the terms that I have just used to describe support.

A further test of the buffering effect of social support was provided by Susan Gore in a dissertation and subsequent publication done within our research program. The study that Gore (1973) reported and that Cobb and Kasl (1977) have now reported more fully was concerned with job loss. As stressful as are some of the characteristics of work, losing a job is the greater stress. Cobb, Kasl, Gore, and their colleagues compared the situation and well-being of those people who lost their jobs when two plants closed down in Michigan with people in similar communities who did not lose their jobs. The research was longitudinal; a series of measures, physiological and self-reported, was done before the plant closed down, during the period of rumor that the plant was closing, and at intervals of six, twelve and twenty-four months after the actual job loss due to the plant closing.

The several effects of job loss under these circumstances show somewhat different curves. Some of them peak during the anticipatory

stage, and some at the moment of actual job loss. Some of them are quickly repaired or compensated for when the individual gets a new job; some of them persist almost to the end of the twenty-four month period of the study. The self-reported effects of job loss included symptoms of depression, anxiety and tension, physical discomfort, sleep interruptions, gastrointestinal difficulties, and reduced activity level. There was reduced interaction with others and reduced investment of energy in other activities. On the physiological side, the effects of job loss included elevation in cholesterol levels and in levels of serum which is associated with symptoms of gout and arthritis.

All of these effects were moderated by the presence of social support--sometimes modestly, sometimes dramatically. For example, arthritis was measured by having the interviewers (who on this study were public health nurses) look for evidence of swollen joints in the hands. There was a tenfold difference in the frequency of arthritic symptoms between those unemployed men who were strongly supported by friends and family (especially spouse) and those who were not. The effects of social support are not unvarying, and the nature of social support is not fully understood, but it appears to be a buffer against stress about which more should be learned. In attempting to acquire that knowledge, however, we should not neglect the exploration of work arrangements that do not require such antidotes.

Two proposals

Let me sum up with a couple of recommendations. We have considered some of the forms that stress takes at work: role conflict, overload, responsibility for persons and for things. We have examined the particularly stressful pattern of simultaneous overload and under-utilization. We have looked more briefly at social support as a buffer between stress and its effects, noting that the phenomenon of stress moderation occurs both when the support is from people at work and when the support is primarily from people in the home situation.

It is reasonable to conclude by asking the question of what we ought to do about all this. One of the things we should do is learn more about the effect of job characteristics on stress, about the role of social support in mitigating job stress, and about the role of the family in providing such support. I think also that action need not wait on additional research. We know enough now to act constructively in a number of ways, and I will mention two.

One is to improve the quality of jobs. We know a great deal about what makes jobs good or bad. By improving the quality of jobs we increase constructive complementarity between the work and the non-work sectors of life. If I were allowed to choose one such improvement, it would be a genuine flexibility with respect to work scheduling. By genuine flexibility I do not mean 30-minute variations in starting times. I mean flexibility with respect to the number of "chunks" or modules of work that an individual undertakes.

For convenience we can think of a module of work as four hours, although that is arbitrary. Flexibility means preferred variations with respect to the number of modules per day, days per week, weeks per year, and years per lifetime. For this kind of flexibility to be seriously considered, we will have to remove the present disincentives for management. Some of these have to do with legislated requirements--fringe benefits, social security, and the like. A considerable job of persuading labor unions (not to mention legislatures and managements) of the importance of this development will be required. In my view, it will be worth the effort.

We are currently involved in a series of field experiments in industry which share a common theme. In each of the field settings a joint committee of labor union and management is established. That committee meets initially with a single agenda item--to agree on those things that can be done to improve the quality of work life in the organization. It is not a committee on profitability and it is not a committee on productivity; those things presumably are handled elsewhere. It is not a committee on setting wages; presumably that is done by collective bargaining. It is a committee on making work more worth doing. In the first of those field experiments, the union-management committee faced the question of how individual increases in productivity should be rewarded. The overwhelming preference of the workers in that situation, most of whom were women, was to take the rewards of productivity increases in terms of time. If the production requirements had been met in fewer hours, those workers wanted fewer hours on the job. They were not earning at a great rate, and the decision that time was more valuable than money was not obvious. It was, however, the choice that was made, and it has probably improved the quality of family life.

The second of my proposals is that we teach social support. We should teach not only its importance, but the ways of giving and receiving it, at work and away, as supervisors and managers, as peers, as friends and relatives, and as husbands and wives.

References

- Caplan, R.D. "Organizational stress and individual strain: a sociopsychological study of risk factors in coronary heart disease among administrators, engineers, and scientists." Doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 1972, 32, 6706b-6707b (University Microfilms, 72-14822).
- Cobb, S. "Role Responsibility: The Differentiation of a Concept." In McLean, A. (ed.) *Occupational Stress*. Springfield, IL: Thomas, 1974.
- Cobb, S. and Kasl, S. *Termination: The Consequences of Job Loss*. (Publication No. 77-224). Washington, DC: DHEW (NIOSH), 1977.
- Cobb, S. and Rose, R.M. "Psychosomatic Disease in Air Traffic Controllers: Hypertension, Diabetes and Peptic Ulcer." *Journal of the American Medical Association*, April 23, 1973, 224, 489-492.
- French, J.R.P., Jr., Tupper, C.J. and Mueller, E.F. *Workload of University Professors*. Ann Arbor, MI: Institute for Social Research, 1965.
- Gardell, B. *Arbetsinnehåll och livskvalitet*. Prisma, Stockholm, 1976.
- Gore, S. *The influence of social support and related variables in ameliorating the consequences of job loss*. Ph.D. dissertation. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, 1973.
- Kahn, R.L. "Field studies of power in organizations." In Kahn, R.L. and Boulding, E. (eds.) *Power and Conflict in Organizations*. New York: Basic Books, 1964, 52-66.
- Kraut, A. "A study of role conflicts and their relationships to job satisfaction, tension, and performance." Doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan. (Ann Arbor, MI, University Microfilms, 67-8312, 1965.)
- Russek, H.I. "Emotional stress and coronary heart disease in American physicians." *American Journal of Medical Science*, 240, 1960, 711.
- Sales, S.M. "Differences among individuals in effective, behavioral, biochemical, physiological responses to variation in workload." Doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 1969, 30, 2407-b (University Microfilms, 69-18098).

GROUP PROCESS INTERVENTION RESEARCH
IN ALTERNATIVE HUMAN SERVICE SETTINGS

Shulamit Reinharz
Department of Psychology
University of Michigan

Changes that occur in society are reflected in all of its institutions, including the workplace. People who are interested in affecting social change can deliberately select the workplace as the target arena. Such an effort rests on the assumption that the way we work (i.e., the structure of our work organizations) affects the rest of the way we live. As an institution the workplace has been the scene of continuous experimentation and innovation directed primarily in this country to increasing profits, efficiency and safety.

In the late 1960's and early 1970's, a counterculture flourished in American society challenging these work concerns. The counterculture was composed primarily of young people "and a handful of their adult mentors (Roszak, 1968, p. xii), who wished to call a halt to the war in Vietnam, to speed the process of civil rights, and to alter institutions of higher education. These target institutions proved vulnerable to the impact of the youthful protest and numerous social changes were actually achieved. Less dramatic but equally significant was the experimentation during that period in the creation of new workplaces. The counterculture should not be thought of as an escape from the world of work but as an attempt to modify it to become more humane and joyful. The youth of the counterculture were interested in creating workplaces on the scale of human needs.

The counterculture was thus not merely an attack against existing institutions but a constructive effort to create alternatives. During this period young people, in addition to creating new forms of business, initiated social services to take care of their own needs. This grass-roots service movement stemmed from young people's alienation from and dissatisfaction with the care provided by traditional social services. Clinics dealing with medical, drug, psychological, and family problems proliferated throughout the nation and many continue to exist today. Drop-in centers for runaway youth, alternative schools, crisis hot lines, child care centers and even alternative funding agencies emerged, among others. These settings were begun because traditional social services were not keeping up with social change. The new settings, developed to serve those who did not wish to be

served by establishment agencies, came to be known as "alternative settings." The creation of alternative settings is now recognized by community psychologists as one of the major constructive strategies for promoting social change (Heller and Monahan, 1977).

Alternative human service settings tried to do three things simultaneously: 1) to seek out and be accessible to under-served, needy populations; 2) to deliver innovative services (i.e., create a new philosophy and set of techniques); and 3) to deliver the service in a setting organized along humanistic principles, that is, small, responsive, and nonexploitative of workers. In other words, founders of alternative human service settings were embarked on developing a theory and practice of humane, effective work. They argued that work does not have to be founded on oppressions but can be linked to a sense of community. The counter-culture de-repressed sexuality while it de-oppressed work. It reminds us that we need a theory of work that is psychoanalytically sophisticated and integrates work with other basic human needs.

The alternative human services organizers created settings with the value in mind that the quality of the process of working together was as important as the quality of the service rendered. Good service at the expense of workers was a contradiction and unacceptable, particularly since a widely shared belief was that one way of being helped was to work in the setting as a helper. The line between worker and client was blurred and frequently reversed. In other words, the clients, the types of service and the process-structure of these service workplaces were all innovative. My concern is with the latter element. What were the new structures that were developed to house the new services that were being offered to the new client groups? Why were new structures developed? Are they effective? Are they in need of assistance in order to be sustained?

Alternative human service organizations developed structures in accordance with certain principles. First, the workers need not be credentialed. People could learn on the job, from the clients, and from each other. People with credentials were even suspect. This change implied a critique of the hypercredentialism and mystification of professionalism in our society and the stigmatized position in which clients of social services are placed. This principle empowered all persons, especially young people, to become helpers, given a certain amount of preliminary training. Competence was something to be proved to one's co-workers on the job rather than assumed by virtue of education or experience. Power accrued from demonstrated competence.

Second, the workers attempted to flatten power differences among themselves and operate according to a consensual decision-making process rather than by majority rule or hierarchical supervision. They recognized that knowledge was power, and knowledge was particularly needed by clients if they were to obtain what was rightfully theirs. This attitude is exemplified in the women's self-help movement, in which women were taught to become knowledgeable about their own bodies rather than to remain mystified by physicians.

Wages were usually subsistence rather than competitive and were not markedly differentiated among workers, if at all. Volunteers were relied on to provide most of the labor. Worker tenure was not relied upon to be long, so provisions were made for continuous turnover of personnel, although turnover is defined as a problem for most alternative human service settings. Individuals worked in these settings to achieve certain goals and to enjoy the sense of community, not to develop a career. Efforts were made to reduce or to eradicate explicit or subtle forms of racism, classism, or ageism in the setting. The setting members attempted to create in their organization was a microcosm of the world in which they wished to live.

In certain ways alternative human service organizations can be considered weak and in other ways strong. They have almost always lacked sufficient economic resources to carry out all of their objectives. They have also suffered from suspicion and lack of cooperation from traditional human service workers and local government. On the other hand, they view human energy and potential as a boundless resource. Their ability to attract an almost limitless pool of volunteer, student, or ex-client help has made it possible for them to maintain services. Several federal agencies have been impressed with the alternative's capacity to reach the under-served and to deliver cheap, seemingly effective service, particularly in light of the unverified effectiveness of traditional services (Gordon, 1978). In recent years, therefore, alternative human service settings have found themselves increasingly imbedded in networks that include local traditional services, local government, and federal bureaucracies. They now worry about whether they are being co-opted as they acquire the support of these external resources. Will new alternative settings have to be created to fill the impending vacuum as older alternatives change? Will the co-opted services become less responsive and respectful of clients as they become more responsive and respectful of powerful bureaucracies.

Workers in alternative human services, must cope, as do most people in our society, with rising prices and with concerns about

their future fate as individuals. Not only must the settings provide at least a livable income for workers, but they must provide an image of a viable future in order to sustain the commitment of the workers. The career opportunities for individuals in alternative human service settings are not thought of in terms of increased earning capacity and prestige, but rather in terms of continued meaningful work in which personal objectives defined by the individual worker can be expected to be achieved. These typically include new work challenges, participation in social change efforts, and a lasting sense of community rather than a sense of atomization and exploitation, characteristic of contemporary life. Gratification comes not from tangible rewards, but from the meaningfulness of the work itself, from the maintenance of the alternative philosophy of service and structure, and from the pleasure of the cohesive collective group, expressed primarily in an accepting relaxed style and in consensual decision-making. These sources of gratification are not automatically distributed, as is a regular paycheck, but must be created in order to be received. Thus, members of alternative human service settings must work on sustaining the commitment of their co-workers, so that they can enjoy their partnership. The fragility of this commitment is a source of tension and worry among the workers, just as the demonstration of commitment is the source of pleasure.

Human service settings are not isolated from one another but are part of a larger culture of alternatives, sometimes referred to as "the collective community." Composed nowadays of food co-operatives, health food stores, creative art settings, counseling centers, and others, and continuously spawning new forms of service, these settings compensate for their inadequate resources by linking with one another and trying to draw on each other for strength. The creation of networks among these organizations, analogous to networks and friendships among friends, is universal. The networking effort can only supply energy and resources to network members if it is fed energy and resources by them. Alternative human service workers quickly recognize this dilemma of coalition-building and are caught in the bind of wanting to extend themselves but being unable to afford to.

I believe that alternative human service settings are a valuable feature of contemporary society, deserving of unobtrusive nurturance. Some of the resources of universities can be used to this end. Specifically, I believe that universities can be a laboratory for experimentation with innovative ideas and provide an opportunity for students and faculty to "step outside" of social conventions temporarily, to reflect and investigate. By conducting research on these new, struggling settings,

resources are inadvertently brought to bear which are readily absorbed. These resources include the ideas and competence of the researcher, the students who accompany him/her, plus the networks in which they are linked.

The contemporary researcher has a great responsibility when formulating research problems. At the formative stage of the research process (the stage of problem-definition), perhaps more than at any other time, the values of the researcher come into play. My own values have become quite clear to me through a process of intensive self-examination about the research process (Reinharz, 1979). I believe that research should be conducted in response to a defined social problem as experienced by members of a community. Research cannot be merely intellectually elegant or designed only to fill a gap in the scholarly literature. Because of the chaos, waste, and danger of the contemporary age, it seems imperative to me to remain concerned with pressing problems and to use our privilege as the educated, mobile, leisure class to address social problems. The definition of what constitutes a pressing problem will differ among researchers, but there is no lack of such problems. My orientation is to attempt to alleviate difficulties but also to enhance strengths.

Beyond the issue of problem salience is the preference I have for possessing an experiential base for the knowledge I attempt to generate. This is acquired not only by study but also by participating in the "lived world" of these settings (Girogi, 1970). The experiential base affords me an insider's view which I can then complement with the outsider's view of the detached observer if appropriate. Thus the problem of a research endeavor should be one I can get involved in and possibly have an impact on. In order to gain and sustain access to a setting representing the problem, however, I must demonstrate my respect for the members, and in so doing I will be socialized by them, and thus become knowledgeable about their world. From my socialized perspective I can formulate an experiential analysis of the problem. By immersion in social settings, the skills of the researchers can be disseminated, thereby contributing to the potential enrichment of those settings.

In my own case, my interest in alternative human service settings arose partially from my work as director of an experiential psychology program which places a large number of students in field settings (called Project Outreach). The settings were selected in response to expressed community requests. Thus many of the settings in which the students worked were alternative human service settings. In connection with this role I spent many hours discussing with setting members the nature of

their work in preparation for and during student participation. In these discussions the plight of the alternative settings became vivid. These workers experienced intense stress because of the unpredictability of the future of their organizations, and the immense amount of commitment and energy necessary to sustain them. Their stress was both quantitative--too much work to do--and qualitative--overwhelming responsibilities both for clients and for creation of a new social order. My values led me to the conclusion that if people are struggling for social change in the workplace, then their efforts cannot be wasted but instead must be deliberately supported by social scientists. In my supervision of student assistance to workers and my observation of their work in the settings, I assessed the workers as hovering on the brink of burn-out while remaining open to supportive suggestions and resources. I wondered whether it would be possible to alleviate the stress associated with their work rather than permit that stress to lead to the demise of the settings. I began to work with these organizations first as a listener and observer, then as an organizational consultant helping them in ways they saw fit.

After a series of individual interviews needed for mutual familiarization, regular work-group meetings have been held in one exemplary setting, an alternative bakery. At these meetings we began to focus on enhancing the interpersonal quality of working within the setting, so that the workers themselves would not add to the stress resulting from inadequate resources and inordinate demands, but would support and enjoy each other. We worked on enhancing their interaction, making it more possible for the workers to achieve their task goals while they sustained fulfilling interpersonal relations among themselves. Working with the base of social support that already existed or was blocked by situational interpersonal conflict, we strove to strengthen the social support potential inherent in the working group. Thus we enhanced a competence as a prevention measure against social disintegration. We assumed that these work groups could approach a family model: i.e., they did not have to sacrifice nurturance for task-oriented effectiveness.

We began to conceptualize the process of work as a way of relating to other people within a given structure designed to convert resources into products. In order to understand the process of working together, the method used has been either group process consultation or training workshops. This intervention strategy stemmed from our joint understanding that the quality of the work experience was in large part determined by the flavor of the communications among workers, which contributed greatly to each worker's sense of community among the others. Not only is

work a place where tasks are performed, but it is also a social gathering environment where the bulk of our interaction takes place. As social settings, workplaces are arenas, of both stress and support.

The study method most appropriate for understanding this interaction is action research, i.e., trying to intervene in order to improve a setting in a given direction on the basis of an assessment of that setting. This model is different from that of collecting and analyzing data and then doing nothing, or simply planning and executing an intervention. Instead, we intervene and analyze what we have done, collaboratively. This approach allows us to examine the dimensions of a social setting such as a workplace as an emerging dynamic phenomenon. In addition, the group process consultation intervention transfers skills to the workers as they learn to be more open with one another in the presence of a supportive third party. Workers are asked to address topics that might not be discussed were they only to be observed in their natural interaction. By creating a forum in which people can talk openly about their feelings, the stress that might be present but not vocalized can become explicit, recognized and dealt with in its natural environment, the work group. The vivid nature of the stress, unavailable through the administration of questionnaires, is apparent in these forums. Of course, developing such a procedure is possible only if there is an investment in working through the stress and acknowledging the deficiencies in an organization that is supposed to be ideal.

One source of stress we have discovered is that workers in idealistic alternative organizations are unsure whether to strive for unreachable goals or to be satisfied with those within grasp. The very existence of the alternative serves as a symbol that idealism is viable, yet once created, the ideals to which the alternative service should aspire are elusive. Ideals are motivators, but can they be turned into blueprints? How can the ideal of "serving anyone who needs help" be reconciled with the fact that certain clients are dangerous, excessively disruptive or overly demoralizing? In alternative settings, goals need to be translated periodically into guidelines for resolving dilemmas and crises. Group process consultation research has helped settings convert their stress and dilemmas into an opportunity for clarifying the setting's purpose in ways that the setting members are willing to live/work with. The consultant/researcher can thus observe and assist the alternative workplace to define itself continuously.

A second source of stress within the interpersonal relations of alternative human service workers is that the rhetoric

of community does not vanquish other emotions such as anger, feelings of rejection or suspicion on the job. One aspect of our research has been to uncover the emotions that arise in the workplace. There appear to be all sorts of organizationally specific interpersonal feelings. Just as anger is suppressed in families and released in family therapy, so too anger can be present in the workplace and expressed in group process consultation. A major insight of an alternative human service worker is that s/he is not alone in experiencing anger, and that anger will have to be accepted as part of the job. Just as women believe(d) that they should not feel or express anger, so too these workers frequently believe the same, thus rendering them incapable of dealing with it, except in displacement on some internal or external scapegoat. If a worker discusses "negative" emotions in a forthright manner within the work group, s/he risks shattering the image of "the collective," and thus, s/he believes, endangers his/her place in it. We are working instead toward defining anger as a natural, inevitable component of work. If this is true, then the group must develop acceptable ways for anger to be expressed in the organization without jeopardizing the organization or the people in it. In one alternative human service setting, the hiring procedures were revised to include having applicants discuss how they typically express anger, and what their attitudes are toward the anger-expression style of the other workers. The message to new workers has been reframed: all workers will become angry. We expect that workers will express their anger in a way that is constructive rather than suppressing it in a way that is destructive, and do so immediately rather than after a delay.

In conclusion, alternative human service settings are special workplaces created by people in accordance with a variety of ideals. The work they choose to do is arranged in a special way, so that the purveyors of the services can derive a sense of personal satisfaction and community from the arduous, underpaid work they have set out for themselves. Their dream of creating the ideal service workplace is continuously impeded since the workers are simply human. They have been socialized in a far-from-perfect society. The settings are also limited by inadequate resources. Nevertheless, alternative human service workers have taken partial control over their lives and in so doing have created a laboratory for the ideal workplace. The research we are doing is intended to examine that laboratory and to assist it to achieve some of its goals.

Selected Bibliography

- Appley, D.B. and Winder, A.E. "Collaboration in Work Settings,"
A special Issue of the *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*,
13, 3, 1977.
- Baldwin, B. "Alternative Services, Professional Practice and
Community Mental Health." *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*,
45, 5, 1975, 734-743.
- Gamson, Z. et al. "Collective Work in Small Alternative Enter-
prises." Unpublished manuscript, Residential College,
University of Michigan, 1978.
- Girogi, A. "Toward Phenomenologically-based Research in Psychology."
Journal of Phenomenological Psychology, Fall 1970, 1, 1, 75-98.
- Gordon, J. "Alternatives in Transition." *C/O Journal of Alter-
native Human Services*, 1976, 2, 3, 18-21.
- Gordon, J. "Final Report to the President's Commission on
Mental Health of the Special Study of Alternative Mental
Health Services." Washington, DC: 1978.
- Heller, K. and Monahan, J. *Psychology and Community Change*.
Homewood, IL: Dorsey, 1977.
- Kanter, R.M. and Zurcher, L.A. (eds.) "Alternative Institutions."
A special issue of the *Journal of Applied Behavior Science*,
9, 2/3, 1973.
- Marcuse, H. *Eros and Civilization*. New York: Vintage, 1955.
- Reinharz, S. *On Becoming a Social Scientist*. San Francisco:
Jossey-Bass, 1979.
- Roszak, T. *The Making of a Counter Culture*. Garden City, NY:
Doubleday, 1968.

COMPENSATION vs. SPILLOVER

IN WORK AND NON-WORK RELATIONSHIPS

Excerpt from
a Panel Discussion
Denise Rousseau
Institute for Social Research
University of Michigan

Most of my research focussed on three basic functions. The first is an attempt in work organizations in industry to find fundamental and lawful relations among phenomena, such as work and non-work, and people's responses to these activities. Secondly, my research tries to be evaluative: to identify the effects of certain types of organizational designs on responses to work. The third is diagnostic. Often the opportunity for a researcher to come into an organization is a result of the problems the organization happens to be having. Some of the studies that I have been able to do were fortuitously made available to me because an organization had a particular problem, such as high turnover or absenteeism. In one case the head of engineering in a radio broadcasting station had had a heart attack and died on the job; everybody was frightened and anxious. That's a very extreme case, but the function of research in that case was diagnostic: let's find out what's happening.

The research described in this brief presentation concerns the work--non-work relationship. Two types of relationships appear to exist between work and non-work. The first and most common is the spillover effect, which means that what you find on the job is a certain level of challenge, a certain level of decision-making or other characteristic, which parallels off-work activities. Spillover exists where similar patterns of activities at work and off work are found.

The second type of relationship found is a compensatory one. That means that if you are able to satisfy your needs on the job, then you don't need to do so off the job. In that case, you're going to find qualitative differences between work and non-work activities. The compensatory relationship is very seldom found in organizational research despite the fact that managers often cite examples supporting such a relationship between work and non-work of their employees. Many managers seem to believe that if a job is really boring for workers, they will make up for it off the job by having a high old time. If a job is really stressful, stimulating, or challenging, requiring a lot of a person, a compensatory model holds that workers are going to use home life to recuperate and prepare themselves for the next day.

However, based on my own research and on a review of the literature on the work-non-work relationship, a spillover relationship is much more common. People who have jobs high in challenge and responsibility, are likely to have home lives similar to their work lives, in terms of both family and community activities. One often cited job-finding involves people who have been given more autonomy and decision-making on the job. They often find that they start taking a more active interest in community affairs and run for the school board or town council, an increase in political activity following increased opportunity for decision-making on the job.

The opposite effect holds true too. People in very routine, boring jobs, such as assembly-line work, tend to have a home life that centers largely around a TV set. This observation is particularly true for workers who have jobs that are not people-related. People who deal with machines day in and day out, whose jobs are controlled by a machine, are more likely to have non-work activities centered around such mechanical things as a TV or similar escape. They often have very little interaction with other people, even family members, off the job. This pattern is something that researchers are becoming more aware of, even though there is a good deal of denial on the part of managers that work and non-work are as closely related as we seem to find them.

My studies further reveal that some of the variables commonly defined as organizational behavior--such as absenteeism and job-related stress and attitudes--are very highly correlated with non-work activity, such as the amount of variety and challenge people experience off the job. This finding indicates to me that the boundary between the effects of work and non-work is a fairly cloudy one. Still another finding in the spillover versus compensation question is that those people who have demonstrated a compensatory relationship between work and non-work very frequently have jobs with extreme physical conditions--coal miners, fishermen, and air traffic controllers. Outside work they are oriented toward activities involving very different kinds of things than they do on the job. Most people, however, instead of compensating for what they experience on the job, demonstrate spillover effect; hence the expression, "the long arm of the job."

My work is directed primarily to three groups: the scientific community which values a more quantitative approach to research, the individual managers who let me into the organization to study it in the first place, and the employees to whom I give feedback. It's very difficult to do research on the relationship of work to non-work without the aura of impartiality about your study. Questionnaires look nice, neat, and impartial. I find that feedback through a questionnaire is taken a little bit more seriously than feedback from some other means by which I might collect data. Employees are very interested in how other people have responded. By comparing themselves with others in their groups or organization they can make some useful evaluation of their own work experiences.

CORPORATE DAY CARE

AND THE PLAY LIFE OF THE CHILD

Excerpt from a
Panel Discussion
Val Suransky
Dept. of Educational Psychology
University of Michigan

The impact of elementary and secondary schooling on generations of children who spend 11 to 12 years in maintenance institutions has until recently been underestimated. Family patterns of socialization have been emphasized, yet school socialization undervalued. How much greater is this impact when "schooling" is brought down to the very young?

Correlative with the changing roles of women, of female emancipation from domesticity, and of the burgeoning needs of industry for a female labor force, children as young as two years old now spend up to 10 hours a day, 5 days a week in a day care institution. The rapid use of the day care movement has resulted in a premature transference of socialization patterns from the family to the school. This transference has embedded in it an inherent assumption: that nurturant loving care is provided and that appropriate affective and cognitive enrichment is present. Yet there is scant public information in this area and few academic studies that point to the nature of the life experience within this context.

Recent studies on day care have not directed sufficient attention to the quality of the child's play-life nor to the everyday child life-experiences that characterize their fifty hours of institutionalized care per week. This experience needs to be placed in a dialectical perspective where the social relationships formed in this micro-institution are seen to mirror those of the macro-social milieu.*

In order to explore the world of the child in such settings, I, the researcher, needed to become an insider, to function as an anthropologist would function, in exploring the "culture" of institutionalized childhood. To this end I did not attempt to become a detached, objective researcher or lab experimenter, but rather pursued a phenomenological mode of investigation, where I, as participant observer, inserted myself into the immediate landscape of experience. I chose to assume the role of a participant-observer

*Much of this paper is based on: Val Suransky. "The Erosion of Childhood: A Social Phenomenological Study of Early Institutionalization." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Michigan, 1977.

because I believe that the researcher, if seeking to understand the reality of another individual or group or culture, needs to embed him/herself in that setting and to adopt a dialectical approach in order to analyse the nature and complexity of that social landscape.

Unfortunately, the dominant contemporary trend in most social science departments here and elsewhere across the country is toward the quantification of social experience and the manufacture of computerized sets of generalizations, that are alienated from both one's subjects and original field of study.

As the researcher, one needs to be self-critically aware of the role that one plays in either legitimating the current status quo or working actively toward a transformation of that system.

This phenomenological study led me on an 18-month journey into five unique day care environments and provided me with a fascinating insight into the culture of day care in this country. Since I was searching for the essence of the child's first experience of institutionalization, I was primarily interested in the youngest group of children within each pre-school, where the children were still newcomers to the structure. However, all age levels, from eighteen months to six years, were observed during the course of the study.

Initial visits were made during the spring of 1974 to pre-schools in the same geographical area. These preschools were selected, after an initial broad survey, on the basis of variation with respect to income level, ethnicity, curriculum, ideology, staff-child ratio, social ecology and self-defined description along a traditional to free-school continuum. Permission to make weekly or biweekly visits to the centers was given by the directors and parental consent obtained where necessary.

During the ensuing two years, between 1974 and 1976, I maintained a flexible schedule of bi-weekly two-hour visits to each of the preschools. As I became more and more a part of each landscape my status as an outsider changed to that of a familiar insider, and I was asked to work in two of the schools when staff crises arose.

As my familiarity with the schools increased, I began to see the experiential landscape with a different lens, noting interactional nuances that had hitherto passed unnoticed. A central orientation directing my observations was to see beyond the administrative mask shielding each structure, to delve beneath the manifest levels of program organization and content and attempt to understand the world of the child.

What was the nature of the young child's experience within these so-called normal institutions and what was the impact of this process of early institutionalization?

A dialectical analysis of my participant observation data generated a number of overriding questions and concerns that I will briefly highlight here.

Work vs. Play. One of the consistent patterns that I observed in many of the centers was a strong emphasis on getting the children "to work" with a resultant denial of the play culture of the child. Given the fact that children in many of these settings ranged in age from 18 months to 6 years, one must question such an anti-play orientation where, particularly in the corporation profit-run centers, almost all activities were geared to the production of commodities and artifacts, rather than to allowing the children to engage in their own process of self-discovery.

Corporate day care. Another concomitant issue that reaches into the macro-social arena is the rapid rise of profit-run day care centers. As more and more children from lower and middle income families move into child care settings, there has been a corresponding rise in the number of day care corporations that are springing up from coast to coast. One of the immediate problems that profit-run centers present is the tendency to provide mass depersonalized care, where children become the exchange commodities in a flourishing new trade. One needs to pose the inevitable question: "Can you serve children the same way you serve Kentucky Fried Chicken?" Within the last decade franchise day care centers have mushroomed their way across the country and mass-produced children are its products--duly institutionalized on a daily diet of TV and a franchised "educational" program.

In order to demonstrate the maladaptive corporate environments provided for these children, I selected a series of observations drawn from one such corporate day care center. These observations are not unusual, but rather typify the patterns of interaction that characterize such environments.

In the case described both a nursery and a day care program were housed in the same building. The children who attended the nursery were predominantly drawn from middle income families, attended half-time and received a qualitatively different and higher priced experience. The children attending the day care program came from low income families and spent 10 hours per day, 5 days per week at the center. The children in both these groups were treated differently. Day care children wore D.C. tags on their backs identifying them as such. They received inferior snacks (diluted juice and dry crackers in contrast to the nursery children's regular juice and cookies); they were placed in larger classes with untrained teacher-aides, and they had only secondary access to space and materials. Black children were disproportionately placed in day care, and both sexism and racism were in evidence. The following observations, drawn from the above center, exemplify the alienating and abusive environment provided for its young charges.

Observation #1. As I knocked on the block room door, an aide opened it and I squeezed through the narrow space. Before I could close the door, two children ducked under my arm and ran out. The aide ran after them, grabbed them back and locked the door. When I rose and left a half hour later, the same attempted escape occurred and the aide ran out trying to round up the children. As I stood in the corridor watching, I became aware that the 16 children in the block room were unattended. I walked back in and witnessed one child threatening to hit another with a heavy wooden truck, which I removed amidst an almost deafening noise level: screaming, stomping, throwing of blocks, and thudding. I remained there for 20 minutes before any staff member re-entered.

Observation #2. During snack time for the nursery children, two day care children were eating lunch from their lunchboxes at another table in the basement. The nursery school teacher served banana bread to her group--bread the group had made--saying, "Is it good? Are we good cooks?" The day care children sat silently watching the other children eat. After a while the teacher, noticing them, handed them two end pieces with honey. They nodded thank you and ate up the leftovers.

Observation #3. During a visit to the wooden block room, where the four-year-old day care children spent much of their time, I observed the teacher sitting at a table, tapping a tune with his fingers, seemingly a spectator to an almost deafening uproar in the room. After a few minutes, he stood up and walked around. One child, Jack, sat on a large wooden truck and tried to ride it. Teacher! "Hey, I told you not to sit on it--leave the room!" The child began to cry and lay down. Teacher to another child, "Well, I guess Jack's dead--you can have his blocks now!"

Observation #4. As I entered the "Blind Man's Bluff" game room, I witnessed an ugly incident. Coleman was standing in the center of the room with his head down, sobbing. Next to him was a puddle of urine. The teacher shouted at him and called him "a stupid baby." The other children joined in and began to laugh and ridicule him. The teacher ordered Coleman to fetch a mop from the bathroom "and mop up your own pee." Coleman wept bitterly as he did this and afterwards he was told to stand in a corner with his back to the class as punishment. The child looked devastated. His face was streaked with tears, and he would not take his eyes off the floor.

Observation #5. The teacher Nellie, who was new, appeared self-conscious and suspicious of me at our first meeting today. She told me that the "kids are unusually wild today." Kids were fighting each other, using assorted makeshift weapons--a baseball bat, a wooden pole, wooden blocks, plastic trays. Nellie continued to shout "Stop it," but no one took any notice. She dragged two children out of the room, pushed one into the corner and ran back to switch off the lights as the basement turned to near chaos. One boy hit another on the head with a baseball bat. The environment was dangerous. I was hit twice by flying tennis balls and ducked to avoid a baseball bat. I noticed Coleman (see Observation 4) beating up other children, hitting one on the head with a truck, and pummeling and punching another. When he noticed me, he came up and asked me, "Would you stay all day?" and "Will you come back another day?" I told him I would and he spoke to me for a few minutes. When the children were told to line up for the TV room, he seemed to attack randomly two other children who began to cry. He was sent to the back of the line. As the children walked out, four were screaming and one little girl was holding her head.

The above observations that I have cited reflect a continuing pattern of anomie, violence, interpersonal insularity and general psychological abuse in this "anti-child" environment. Suffice it to say, that Coleman, the child cited in the above observations, became one of the deviants of this institution.

The Social Manufacture of Deviance. Another major theme that emerged from the study of the above center, as well as others cited in my study, was the social construction of deviance. As I explored the nature of deviance within these institutions and followed up the casualties in various referral centers, it became clear to me that one needed to question the labelling process that characterized the child as deviant or pathological. In fact, the institution in question, was distinctively anti-child and possibly pathological itself. Should deviance be seen as a quality intrinsic to a child, or should we view it as embedded in the dialectical interaction with an institution that manufactures childhood pathology by creating an environment where children are socialized into detachment and non-attachment, where they do not matter existentially but rather matter instrumentally? These children were the instruments of a corporate institution dedicated to material gain and profit, not to the care and education of children.

In conclusion. I would like to say that despite my strong critique of the current reality of day care in this country, I do not oppose day care as such, but rather condemn the deficient, inadequate and alienating environments that the majority of our children are subjected to in the hands of a burgeoning child care industry. I continue to look forward to and actively work for the social restructuring of such a system, where warm, nurturant, "child-loving" centers will be created that allow children both their childhood and their "playhood."